

Durham E-Theses

Jesus four speeches in the Galilean ministry (Lk 4.14-9.50) : rhetorical texture, narrative trajectories, and appropriation by authorial readers of Luke-Acts

Spencer, Patrick E.

How to cite:

Spencer, Patrick E. (2005) *Jesus four speeches in the Galilean ministry (Lk 4.14-9.50) : rhetorical texture, narrative trajectories, and appropriation by authorial readers of Luke-Acts*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1776/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

**Jesus' Four Speeches in the Galilean
Ministry (Lk 4.14-9.50): Rhetorical Texture,
Narrative Trajectories, and Appropriation
by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts**

by
Patrick E. Spencer

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

University of Durham
Department of Theology and Religion
2005

**A copyright of this thesis rests
with the author. No quotation
from it should be published
without his prior written consent
and information derived from it
should be acknowledged.**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION x

ABSTRACT xi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xii

PART ONE:
CURRENT STATUS OF RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATION

CHAPTER 1: Understanding Today’s Scholarly Landscape: Jesus’ Four Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches 2

1 Previous Investigation of the Four Galilean Ministry Speeches 6

1.1 First Galilean Speech (4.14-30) 7

1.2 Second Galilean Speech (6.17-49) 8

1.3 Third Galilean Speech (7.24-35) 10

1.4 Fourth Galilean Speech (8.4-18) 11

2 Investigation of the Narrative Discourse of Luke-Acts 12

2.1 Formalism Lays the Foundation: Narrative Criticism 13

2.2 Initial Queries Beyond Formalism: Sociological Exploration 19

2.3 Moving Beyond Formalism: Integrating Reader-Response Criticism 22

2.4 Other Narrative, Sociological, Reader-Response Investigations 26

2.4.1 Characterization 26

2.4.2 Investigation of Narrative Redundancies and Intertextuality 29

2.5 Embracing An Integrated Hermeneutic: Ideological Systems and Location 31

3 Concluding Summary 40

CHAPTER 2: A Methodological Foundation for Investigation: Towards Reading as Conduction 42

1 A Philosophical Framework 43

2 The Playground: Author, Text, and Reader 47

2.1 Encountering and Appropriating the Otherness 48

2.2 Interpretation and Overinterpretation 53

3	Constructing Meaning: Combination, Selection, and the Imaginary	55
3.1	Reading Dynamics, the Implied Reader, and Authorial Readers . . .	56
3.1.1	Theophilus: Literary Patronage	58
3.1.2	Extratextual and Intertextual Repertoire	61
3.1.3	Authorial Readers and Ideological Location	62
3.2	Processing Texts: Consistency and Coherence	65
3.2.1	Rhetorical Argument	66
3.2.2	Intertextual Echoes and Weaving	67
3.2.3	Constructing Plot, Theme, Characterization, and Motifs (<i>Topoi</i>)	69
3.3	Interpretation as Conduction: The Fictive and the Imaginary	75
4	Concluding Summary	78
CHAPTER 3: Greco-Roman Rhetorical Argument: Delimiting Rhetorical Texture		80
1	Greco-Roman Handbook Rhetoric	81
1.1	Rhetorical Invention, Arrangement, and Style	82
1.2	Rhetorical Handbooks and New Testament Rhetoric	84
2	Delimiting the Parameters of Rhetorical Texture	87
2.1	Rhetorical Proof: <i>Logos, Pathos, Ethos</i>	89
2.2	Rhetorical Questioning	90
2.3	Maxims	91
2.4	Enthymemes	92
3	Speeches in Ancient Greco-Roman Narrative	100
4	Conclusion	102

PART TWO:
RHETORICAL TEXTURE OF THE FOUR LUKAN GALILEAN SPEECHES

CHAPTER 4: First Galilean Speech (4.14-30): Hometown Synagogue Rejects New Patronal Boundaries		104
1	Rhetorical Situation	104
2	Rhetorical Texture	106

2.1	Introduction (4.18-20)	107
2.2	Statement of Case (4.21-22)	109
2.3	Body of Argument (4.23-27)	110
2.4	Missing Conclusion (4.28-30)	113
3	Concluding Summary	113
CHAPTER 5: Second Galilean Speech (Lk 6.17-49): A New Ethical Mode of (Non-Reciprocal) Benefaction		
1	Rhetorical Situation	116
2	Rhetorical Argument	118
3	Rhetorical Texture	120
3.1	Introduction (6.20-26)	121
3.1.1	First Three Pair of Blessing/Woe Clusters	123
3.1.2	Final Blessing/Woe Cluster	125
3.1.3	Enthymemic Argument Generates Rhetorical Texture	126
3.2	Statement of Case (6.27-31)	131
3.2.1	Overarching <i>Topos</i> : Loving Your Enemies (6.27-28)	133
3.2.2	What It Means to Love Your Enemies (6.29-30)	135
3.2.3	Rationale for the Statement of Case (6.31)	138
3.3	Body of Argument (6.32-45)	140
3.3.1	Unconditional Patronage: First Segment (6.32-36)	140
3.3.2	Friendship Without Boundaries: Second Segment (6.37-42)	147
3.3.3	Rationale for the Body: Third Segment (6.43-45)	153
3.4	Conclusion (6.46-49)	157
4	Concluding Summary	159
CHAPTER 6: Third Galilean Speech (Lk 7.24-35): Jesus, John the Baptist, and Their Disciples and Opponents		
1	Rhetorical Situation	161
2	An Amplified Chreia	163
3	Rhetorical Texture	166

3.1	Introduction (7.24-27)	167
3.2	Statement of Case (7.28)	169
3.3	Narrative Aside (7.29-30)	171
3.4	Body of Argument (7.31-34)	172
3.5	Conclusion (7.35)	176
4	Concluding Summary	179
 CHAPTER 7: Fourth Galilean Speech (Lk 8.4-18): Sowing Character Taxonomies for the Implied Reader		
1	Rhetorical Situation	182
2	Rhetorical Texture	184
2.1	Introduction (8.5-8a)	184
2.2	Statement of Case (8.9-10)	187
2.3	Body of Argument (8.11-15)	189
2.3.1	First Example: Sowing Along the Path	192
2.3.2	Second Example: Sowing on the Rock	193
2.3.3	Third Example: Sowing Among the Thorns	195
2.3.4	Fourth Example: Sowing into Good Ground	196
2.4	Conclusion (8.16-18)	197
2.5	<i>Inclusio</i> : 8.1-3 and 8.19-20	201
3	Concluding Summary	202

**PART THREE:
NARRATIVE TRAJECTORIES AND HERMENEUTICAL
APPROPRIATION BY AUTHIORIAL READERS**

CHAPTER 8: Disputed Issues: The Unity of Luke-Acts and the Representation of the Jewish People		
1	Luke-Acts: Coherent or Incoherent (Dis)Unity	206
1.1	Incoherence Leads to View of Disunity	208
1.1.1	Generic Incoherence	209
1.1.2	Narrative Differences	211
1.1.3	Theological Dissonance	212
1.2	Coherent Unity	213
1.2.1	Generic Coherence	213

1.2.2	Narrative Connections, Echoes, and Coherence	217
1.2.3	Theological Congruence	222
2	Representation of the Jewish People (Israel)	223
2.1	Conclusion of Acts (28.17-31): Future Hope for the Jewish People	224
2.2	Final Separation Between the Jewish People and Salvation	226
2.3	Eschatological Judgment for All of the Jewish People	228
2.4	Representation of Paul and His Embodiment of Jewish Culture and the Law	229
3	Concluding Summary	230
CHAPTER 9: Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories: Generation of Plot, Characterization, and <i>Topoi</i>		232
1	A Methodological Basis and Framework	234
2	Framing the Narrative Discourse: Lukan Prologue	237
3	First Speech of the Galilean Ministry (Lk 4.14-30)	238
3.1	Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture	239
3.2	Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization	241
3.2.1	Details on Jesus' Characterization	242
3.2.2	Jesus' Hometown Synagogue and Those Who Repudiate "Salvation"	243
3.3	Narrative Trajectories Engender <i>Topoi</i>	243
3.3.1	Forgiveness of Sin and Jubilee Legislation	244
3.3.2	A Type Scene: A Paradigm of Proclamation	246
4	Second Speech in the Galilean Ministry (Lk 6.17-49)	247
4.1	Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture	247
4.2	Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization	249
4.2.1	Jesus: Embodiment of Moses, Elijah, and Elisha	249
4.2.2	Opponents of Jesus	251
4.2.3	True Disciples	251
4.3	Narrative Trajectories Engender <i>Topoi</i>	252
4.3.1	Reversal of Fortunes	252

4.3.2	Material Benefaction	253
4.3.3	A New Mode of Benefaction: Ethical Comportment of Disciples	254
4.3.4	Discipleship Equals Action	256
4.3.5	Ethical Actions Derive from the Heart	257
5	Third Speech of the Galilean Ministry (7.24-35)	258
5.1	Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture	258
5.2	Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization	263
5.2.1	Characterization of John the Baptist	264
5.2.2	Characterization of Jesus	266
5.2.3	Characterization of the Pharisees and Lawyers	266
5.2.4	Characterization of All the People and the Tax Collectors	268
5.3	Narrative Trajectories Engender <i>Topoi</i>	268
6	Fourth Speech of the Galilean Ministry (8.4-18)	270
6.1	Constructing Meaning from Rhetorical Texture	270
6.2	Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization	274
6.2.1	First Sowing Example: Sowing Along the Path	275
6.2.2	Second Sowing Example: Sowing on the Rock	276
6.2.3	Third Sowing Example: Sowing Among the Thorns	277
6.2.4	Fourth Sowing Example: Sowing into the Good Soil	279
6.3	Narrative Trajectories Engender <i>Topoi</i>	282
6.3.1	Maturation, Production of Fruit, Importance of “Doing”	283
6.3.2	Condemnation of and Triumph Over Divination and Magic	284
6.3.3	Repudiation and Persecution Results in Apocalyptic Condemnation	284
6.3.4	Discipleship and the “Heart” (καρδία)	285
7	Concluding Summary	286
CHAPTER 10: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers and Ideological Transformation		287
1	Getting from Implied Reader to Authorial Readers	288
2	Appropriation by Authorial Readers	290
3	Identifying Different Authorial Readers	292

4	Authorial Readers and Ideological Transformation	295
4.1	Reinterpretation of Honor and Shame Protocols	295
4.1.1	Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the First Galilean Speech	296
4.1.2	Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the Second Galilean Speech	298
4.1.3	Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the Third Galilean Speech	300
4.1.4	Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the Third Galilean Speech	301
4.2	Reshaping Benefaction	302
4.3	Expansion of Religious and Ethnic Boundaries	305
4.4	Jesus, John the Baptist, and Their Disciples	309
4.5	Hermeneutical Appropriation and Gender Dimensions	311
5	Concluding Summary	314

**PART FOUR:
CONCLUDING SUMMARY – FROM GALILEE TO ROME**

CHAPTER 11: Conclusion: Rhetorical Texture, Narrative Trajectories, and Appropriation by Authorial Readers		318
1	Concluding Comments on Rhetorical Texture	319
1.1	First Galilean Speech (Lk 4.14-30	319
1.2	Second Galilean Speech (Lk 6.17-49)	320
1.3	Third Galilean Speech (7.24-35)	321
1.4	Fourth Galilean Speech (8.4-18)	322
1.5	Assessing the Rhetorical Texture of the Four Galilean Speeches . .	322
2	Concluding Comments on Narrative Trajectories	325
2.1	Theme and Plot	326
2.2	Characterization	326
2.2.1	Jesus	326
2.2.2	The “Poor”	327
2.2.3	Opponents of Jesus and His Disciples	328
2.2.4	Failed Disciples	329
2.2.5	Four Sowing Activities Demarcate Four Character Taxonomies	329
2.3	<i>Topoi</i>	330

2.3.1	<i>Topoi</i> Overlapping All Four Galilean Speeches	330
2.3.2	<i>Topoi</i> Found in One Speech Only	332
3	Concluding Comments on Redactional Indicators	333
4	Appropriation by Authorial Readers	335
5	Areas for Future Investigation	336
5.1	Luke-Acts: Speeches and Narrative Discourse	336
5.2	Speeches in Ancient Greco-Roman Narrative	338
6	Contributions to Other Issues in Lukan Studies	340
6.1	Luke-Acts Unity	341
6.2	Representation of the Jewish People	342
6.2.1	First Galilean Ministry Speech	343
6.2.2	Second Galilean Ministry Speech	344
6.2.3	Third Galilean Ministry Speech	344
6.2.4	Fourth Galilean Ministry Speech	345
6.3	Lukan Community	346
6.4	Methodological Implications	352
6.4.1	Redaction Criticism and the Integrated Hermeneutic	353
6.4.2	Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories	354
6.4.3	Ideological Systems and Hermeneutical Transformation	354
6.4.4	Authorial Readers and Hermeneutical Appropriation	355
7	Concluding Summary	356
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	358

Declaration

This dissertation is the product of my own work, and the work of others has been properly acknowledged throughout.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

Varying degrees of attention are paid to Jesus' four speeches in the Galilean ministry (Lk 4.14-9.50) of the Gospel of Luke. Despite increasing interest in ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric in biblical studies, few scholars examine the speeches from the lens of ancient rhetorical argument. In addition, with the exception of the inaugural speech in Lk 4.14-30, little attention is afforded to the relevance of the speeches for understanding larger nuances of the narrative discourse. In contrast, my study examines each speech from the context of ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical argument and pinpoints various narrative trajectories – as associated with theme, plot, characterization, and *topoi* – that emerge from the rhetorical texture. Hermeneutical appropriation occurs on the level of authorial readers – a multidimensional construct consisting of various cultural systems.

Part One, which encompasses chapters one, two, and three, addresses the current status of research regarding Jesus' four Galilean ministry speeches and the larger narrative of Luke-Acts and lays a methodological foundation for investigation. Part Two, which includes chapters four, five, six, and seven, demarcates the rhetorical texture for each of the four speeches. Part Three, comprising chapters eight, nine, and ten, addresses the speeches in the context of the larger Lukan narrative discourse and modes of hermeneutical appropriation from the standpoint of the authorial audience. Part Four, consisting of chapter eleven, brings coalescence around the investigative inquiries of chapters nine and ten and closes with the conclusion that the four speeches function as “sign posts” that are integral in guiding the Lukan narrative from the “backwaters” of Galilee to the center of the Roman empire.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The “way” from Galilee to Jerusalem to Rome is a lengthy, event-filled, often-treacherous journey that plots a map of unrelenting endurance. Regardless of the protagonist who is on the “way,” Jesus and his disciples in the Gospel of Luke and then Peter, Paul, and others in the Book of Acts, the journey is propelled by actions of non-reciprocal benefaction. In many ways, my academic journey parallels the journeys in Luke and Acts: in both length and non-reciprocal benefaction. The journey started at Abilene Christian University with undergraduate studies in 1985 and then graduate studies in 1988. In 1994, I initiated three years of doctoral study at the Graduate Theological Union and, in 1998, began the final stage of the doctoral sojourn at the University of Durham.

Wherever I have found myself, I have been blessed with Lukan-like non-reciprocal benefaction. My greatest expression of gratitude is to Stephen C. Barton, who, as my advisor, not only graciously agreed to work with me as a doctoral candidate in 1998 but has shown utmost patience and insight during the writing of the dissertation. Indeed, without his unwavering direction, I assuredly would have gotten lost – through my own foibles and disillusionment – somewhere along the “way” from Berkeley to Durham.

I am indebted to many patrons – faculty and students – from the time I spent at the Graduate Theological Union. The basis of my methodological foundation, which comprises Chapter Two, is the result of a Newhall Fellowship research grant on which I worked with Herman C. Waetjen, for whom I have great admiration as both scholar and human being. Special thanks is also due to Joel B. Green, who, at the time of my

studies at the Graduate Theological Union, served as advisor, friend, and mentor. My recognition of the importance of Greco-Roman rhetoric as part of the interpretive endeavor is the result of course work and critical discussions with Mary Ann Tolbert, for whom I served as a teaching assistant. Other professors – through course work and collegial interaction – helped make my studies at the Graduate Theological Union a stimulating and enriching experience, including Barbara Green, Antoinette C. Wire, and Marvin L. Chaney. Though I developed valued friendships with many of my fellow students, I would like to acknowledge Gregory A. Camp for many thought-provoking exchanges.

Appreciation to professors who provided encouragement as well as an environment of critical inquiry during my studies at Abilene Christian University include Thomas C. Geer, Jack Reese, Everett Ferguson, C. Leonard Allen, and David Wray. Carroll D. Osburn who served as my graduate (thesis) advisor deserves special mention.

Parts of the dissertation were written with my daughter, Kendalia Teng Lei Spencer, either sitting on my lap in front of the computer or working at her table in my office – memories that are sure to last long after those of the actual research and writing processes. I increasingly recognize, as I mature, the exemplary actions of my parents, Eugene and Linda Spencer, who have shown Lukan-like benefaction to neighbors as long as I can remember. I will never be able to express adequately my appreciation for their steadfast support and encouragement. Of course, the beginnings of my journey would not have been possible without my uncle, Shane Sullivan, getting me started on the “way” by introducing me to the Gospel story.

Two dear friends, Dewey and Anita Shealy, were patrons during the darkness of night, providing material and spiritual benefaction by mirroring the teaching and ministry of the Lukan Jesus. Mark L. Mullins, my roommate (and fellow student) of many years during my studies at Abilene Christian University and with whom I served as a co-minister for three and a half years and delivered newspapers for six years, is a “once-in-a-lifetime” friend. I would not have gotten through my sojourns without his wisdom, love, and encouragement – on both personal and academic planes. I have been blessed with other friends such as Timothy Corfman and Wesley Weed, whose friendships also encompass both planes. Mary Ko and Dennis Khoo, like the four friends of the paralytic in Lk 5.17-26, have “carried me to the roof, removed the tile, and lowered me down” many times. Thanks is due to the San Leandro Church of Christ for allowing me to test my methodological wanderings in various classes and sermons. Special appreciation is needed to the Eastside Church of Christ in Hamlin, Texas for permitting Mark and myself to look at biblical texts and liturgical issues from vistas quite foreign to long-held ecclesiastical traditions. Indeed, some of my most valued memories are from the three and a half years I spent in ministry with the church. Additionally, I would like to thank Mimi Basu and Jeff O’Neal, former directors at Sun Microsystems, Inc., for their interest in my academic wanderings and encouragement to bring the journey to a completion.

Finally, and most importantly, my wife, Wan-Yun Lei, has shown exceptional patience and sacrifice, often putting her professional and personal ambitions on hold, as I have slowly inched forward in my academic endeavors. Her love and encouragement, despite my numerous foibles, are a true actualization of Lukan ethics. While such will never make up for all of the nights she has gone to bed by herself and

the unremitting love she has shown to me, I would like to dedicate the dissertation to her.

PART ONE:
CURRENT STATUS OF RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATION

1

UNDERSTANDING TODAY'S SCHOLARLY LANDSCAPE: JESUS' FOUR LUKAN GALILEAN MINISTRY SPEECHES

Proliferation of articles and monographs on literary and sociological aspects of the Gospels and the Book of Acts has accumulated to immense proportions in recent years. Discussion of narrative, rhetorical, sociological, and reader-response criticisms fills their pages, as each study attempts to unearth previously unknown facets of the narrative contained therein.¹ Recent investigative forays into Luke-Acts have brought forth some interesting insights into the narrative of the two volumes in areas such as plot, characterization, and rhetorical strategies² and, in turn, how these shape the construal of the narrative. Most queries, however, stop at this point, manifesting the formalistic predilection that many biblical scholars exhibit in their methodological

¹A good example is the compilation of articles from the journal, *Interpretation*, contained in *Gospel Interpretation: Narrative-Critical & Social-Science Approaches*, ed. Jack D. Kingsbury (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997).

²One of the first to attempt a thorough-going literary analysis of the narrative in Luke-Acts was Charles H. Talbert in *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Society of Biblical Literature Manuscript Series, 20; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974). He followed this initial exploration with *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1982). Robert C. Tannehill built on Talbert's work in *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia and Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1986, 1990), which opened the flood gates for a stream of publications on a wide range of subjects related to plot, characterization, rhetoric, and narrative in Luke-Acts.

approaches. Hence, the manner in which the narrative shapes the ideological location of ancient readers (or, more appropriately, listeners in the case of ancient narrative) remains outside the purview of most studies.³

Growing interest in Greco-Roman rhetoric has produced a number of articles and monographs that assess the invention, arrangement, and style of the speeches in the Gospels and Acts. Since Acts contains more speech material, and moreover its speeches are more attune to the formula delineated in the rhetorical handbooks than the Gospels,⁴ it has received the bulk of scholarly attention, with various inquiries to locate the rhetorical texture of each individual speech and, to a lesser extent, how they contribute to the plot and characterization of the narrative.⁵ Nevertheless, though it contains a number of fairly lengthy speeches by Jesus and is considered – by most – as

³The most well-known critic of biblical scholars as “formalistic” is Stephen D. Moore (*Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989] *passim*). Certain feminist scholars have made the plea for critical reading over the past two decades as well. For an overview of feminist biblical criticism, see the collection of essays in *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Introduction*, vol. 1, ed. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1993) and *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary*, vol. 2, ed. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1994).

⁴The one exception would be the Gospel of Matthew, as its five speeches have been long recognized as integral components of the gospel (see David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* [Bible and Literature Series, 15; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988]), though only passing attention has been paid to their rhetorical invention, arrangement, and style in relationship to plot and characterization of the narrative. However cf. Greg Alan Camp, *Woe to You Hypocrites! Law and Leaders in the Gospel of Matthew* (Ph.D. diss, University of Sheffield, 2003).

⁵See, e.g., Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994); Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company) *passim*, esp. 39-50; Philip E. Satterthwaite, “Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, vol. 1, ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke (The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993) 337-80.

the predecessor to Acts,⁶ Luke has garnered little attention in terms of the rhetorical argument and narrative impact of its speeches. My contention, on the contrary, is that the speeches in Luke are just as integral as those in Acts and, in certain ways, more important to the narrative discourse. Specifically, I propose that the four speeches from the Galilean ministry (4.14-30, 6.17-49, 7.24-35, 8.4-18) serve a vital function in shaping narrative trajectories and moreover appropriation by authorial readers.⁷

Most scholars now recognize that the narrative transition in 9.51 marks a major turning point in Luke-Acts, as Jesus turns his face towards Jerusalem, and the narrative audience and implied reader embark with him on the fateful journey to his death.⁸ The initial stages of Jesus' ministry in 4.14-9.50 consequently pave the way for the construal of later events. Within this context the four speeches of the Galilean ministry establish a foundation upon which the implied reader builds plot and characterization and adumbrates narrative trajectories that result in the construction of thematic motifs

⁶However, cf. Michael Parsons and Richard Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

⁷Every text assumes readers who are cognizant of cultural codes, literary and rhetorical devices, other texts, and so on. This readerly entity best corresponds with what Peter J. Rabinowitz describes as the "authorial audience" (*contra* Umberto Eco's "mock reader" and Wolfgang Iser's "implied reader"). He contends that real, flesh-and-blood readers join the authorial audience by assuming the beliefs, engagements, commitments, and prejudices of the authorial audience ("Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," *Critical Inquiry* 4 [1977] 121-41; idem, *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation* [Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987] *passim*, esp. 15-47; idem, "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *Contemporary Literary Theory*, ed. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow [Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989] 81-100).

⁸See Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997) 394-99, for an overview of 9.51 as a turning point in the plot of the Gospel.

(or *topoi*). These components of the narrative discourse are the matrix from which hermeneutical appropriation occurs.⁹

I propose a course of investigation consisting of four parts, totaling eleven separate chapters. The first section, consisting of this chapter and the two subsequent chapters, will deal with preliminary matters such as prior research, an overarching methodological approach, and an overview of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric. The second section, consisting of a total of four chapters, will investigate the rhetorical texture of the four speeches of Jesus from the Galilean ministry through the standpoint of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric. The third section, consisting of three chapters, will examine the ramifications of this rhetorical analysis from the basis of how narrative trajectories from each of the four speeches guide the implied reader in the construction of theme, plot, characterization, and thematic motifs (or *topoi*). It also will overview how the authorial audience – comprised of varying individuals and groups with different social, gender, religious, and political ideologies – appropriates meaning. The first chapter in this section, chapter eight, will address two separate issues that require resolution in order for the aforementioned to be examined in an adequate manner: the question of unity or disunity of Luke-Acts, and the portrayal of the Jewish people in Luke-Acts. The final section, a concluding chapter, will reflect on the preceding analysis, propose areas for future investigation, and pinpoint areas where my preceding analysis contributes to existing issues of discussion in Lukan studies.

⁹It is more accurate to speak of the audiences of the Gospels and Acts in terms of *listeners* rather than *readers* because of the low literacy levels in antiquity, coupled with the fact that reading was conducted as a presentation before an audience. For more on the oral/audible nature of first-century Greco-Roman society, see Paul J. Achtemeier, “*Omne verbum sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990) 3-27.

1 PRIOR INVESTIGATION OF THE FOUR GALILEAN MINISTRY SPEECHES

The only scholar to approach the speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry from the basis of how they fit – as a coherent whole – into the overall narrative discourse of Luke-Acts is Jeffrey A. Staley. Performing a close reading of the entire narrative in Lk 4.14-9.62, Staley proposes that the three speeches in 4.14-30, 6.17-49, and 8.4-18 inscribe plot developments for narrative units that follow and end with the next ensuing speech.¹⁰ Each of the speeches demarcates new phases in the ministry of Jesus, with the episodes preceding the subsequent speech reflecting thematic motifs established in the earlier speech. One glaring omission in Staley's analysis is that he does not recognize the third speech (7.24-35) as a speech at all and, as a result, how it fits into narrative discourse of the section. (Indeed, he makes little, if any, mention of the third speech.) In addition, his argument goes only "halfway" in responding to queries as to whether an ancient reader would recognize his proposed tripartite "geometric" structure. He is on the right track in suggesting that ancient Greco-Roman literature embodies repetitive "stereotypical scenes and motifs" – and thus presupposes an audience that would easily identify his proposed divisions. The deficiency in his argument lies in his failure to bolster his position by noting parallels between the roles and functions of speeches in ancient narrative and those in Luke-Acts. While Staley is able to pinpoint various narrative trajectories between the three speeches and the narrative sections between each, his focus on narrative texture does not consider

¹⁰"Narrative Structure (Self Stricture) in Luke 4:14-9:62: The United States of Luke's Story World," *Semeia* 72 (1995) 173-213. For an earlier version of the paper, see "'With Power of the Spirit': Plotting the Program and Parallels of Luke 4:14-37 in Luke-Acts," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 281-302.

rhetorical texture – an element I shall argue plays an important role in the construction of narrative discourse and even appropriation by the authorial audience.

1.1 First Galilean Speech (4.14-30)

Of the four speeches in the Galilean ministry, the inaugural speech in 4.14-30 has received, by far, the majority of scholarly attention. In addition to the first two chapters in the Gospel,¹¹ it is seen as programmatic in terms of plot and characterization. Because of its position in the sequence of the narrative – that is, the first public teaching appearance of Jesus, the presence of analeptic and proleptic references, and subsequent summaries of Jesus' ministry that refer back to the speech¹² – the speech defines the basis for Jesus' ministry and message in Luke and that of the church in Acts.¹³ When it comes to understanding the rhetorical texture of the speech within the context of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric and moreover its rhetorical orientation in conjunction to the larger narrative discourse, however, there exists, at best, a smattering of references. Rather, prior focus of biblical scholars concentrates on the intertextuality of the speech – direct and indirect references to LXX passages – and

¹¹Scholarly consensus has overturned the argument of Hans Conzelmann that Lk 1-2 is peripheral to the rest of the narrative in Luke-Acts (*The Theology of Luke*, trans. G. Buswell [New York: Harper & Row, 1960] 118-20, 172). It is now believed the narrative of Luke-Acts is firmly rooted in the discourse of Lk 1-2. The first to challenge Conzelmann's conclusion was Paul S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leandar E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966) 111-30. More recently, Joseph B. Tyson, "The Birth Narratives and the Beginnings of Luke's Gospel," *Semeia* 52 (1991) 103-20.

¹²Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 207, provides a detailed list of reasons supporting the view that Lk 4.14-30 is of central importance to the overall narrative of Luke-Acts.

¹³For a summary of scholarship, see Christopher J. Schreck, "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4:16-30 in Recent Study," in *L'Évangile de Luc–The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Frans Neirynck (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989) 399-471.

intratextuality – analeptic and proleptic connections within the overall narrative. I will build upon these investigations by examining the rhetorical texture of the speech within the context of Greco-Roman rhetoric, and the ways in which its rhetorical argument affects the overarching narrative discourse of the two-volume work.

1.2 Second Galilean Speech (6.17-49)

Most scholars consider the Sermon on the Mount in Matt 5.3-7.27 as exhibiting greater redactional design than the Sermon on the Plain in Lk 6.17-49. Many, therefore, consider the parallel in Luke as a “wayward step child,” spending the bulk of their attention on the Matthean “first born.” In addition, few recognize the overall rhetorical relevance of Lk 6.17-49 to the rest of Luke-Acts, with only passing reference to intertextual connections and intratextual referents.¹⁴ Notwithstanding, three scholars have noted the rhetorical invention and arrangement, though agreement does not exist in regard to either. George A. Kennedy identifies 6.20-27 and 6.39-49 as epideictic *species*: a celebration of the poor and actions to help the poor, and condemnation of the rich and inaction on their part to assist the poor. He places 6.27-38 in the vein of deliberative *species*, an attempt to elicit a decision for future action.¹⁵ He concludes that 6.17-49 “is not a very good speech,” and that whatever persuasive power it holds is with the *ethos* – authority – of Jesus.¹⁶ Hans Dieter Betz, in an appendix to his study on the Matthean Sermon on the Mount, though he does not

¹⁴For an overview, see Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 260-81, and Tannehill, *Luke-Acts*, vol. 1, 206-10.

¹⁵*New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983) 63-67.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 67.

specify the *species* of the speech, identifies three rhetorical sections to the speech: an *exordium* (6.20-26), a main body consisting of three consecutive units (6.27-45), and a *conclusio* (6.46-49).¹⁷ For the middle section, which he does not identify with a standard Greco-Roman speech structure, Betz posits a three-fold division: discussion of the conduct of a disciple in relation to the outside world (vv.27-38), rules concerning conduct within the community (vv.39-42), and conduct towards oneself (vv.43-45). He does not examine the speech in its larger narrative context. S. John Roth pinpoints the four references to Jesus' auditors in 6.20, 6.27, 6.39, and 7.1 as integral to understanding the invention, arrangement, and style of the speech, arguing that 6.20-26 is epideictic, 6.27-38 is deliberative, and 6.39-49 marks a return to epideictic.¹⁸ Roth's discussion is embedded in a larger overview of characterization – that of the character type of the blind, lame, and poor (hereafter “marginalized”) – through which he contends the speech moves along the plot line established in 4.16-30, specifically providing the implied reader with information for better understanding the character group of the marginalized.

Neither Kennedy, Betz, nor Roth, however, consider the rhetorical impact of speeches in Greco-Roman antiquity – particularly those placed at the inaugural stages of narrative – on narrative discourse. In addition, while Roth does argue that 4.14-30 (though he does not consider the unit as a speech)¹⁹ and 6.17-49 contribute to the

¹⁷*The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27)* (Hermenia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 571-640.

¹⁸*The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts* (Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series, 144; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 164-71, esp. 165.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 152-64.

construction of plot and characterization, he only considers the two units in the context of the character group of the marginalized. Despite their deficiencies, these prior efforts lay the foundation for my inquiry, an endeavor that will conduct a thorough analysis of the speech in terms of rhetorical texture and how it contributes to narrative trajectories and the narrative discourse.

1.3 Third Galilean Speech (7.24-35)

Investigation of the speech in 7.24-35 typically partitions the unit into several redactional segments, with little attention in regard to its relationship to the rest of the narrative in Luke-Acts. Its overall coherence as a rhetorical unit is thus largely overlooked.²⁰ Regardless, several have attempted to locate the narrative unit within the context of the larger narrative. For example, John A. Darr argues that it plays a pivotal role in the characterization of John the Baptist – establishing a means for comparing the ministry of John the Baptist to that of Jesus.²¹ Roth subsequently pinpoints various connections between its rhetorical argument and characterization of the marginalized elsewhere in Luke-Acts. Specifically, by means of intertextual linkages with the LXX and intratextual connections with earlier episodes in the narrative, he posits that the implied author expands upon the characterization of Jesus as an agent of salvation to a broad canvas of character groups, including sinners – a group outside the parameters

²⁰An exception is Ron Cameron, “‘What Have You Come Out to See?’ Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels,” *Semeia* 49 (1990) 35-69. See chapter six for a discussion of his rhetorical analysis of Lk 7.18-35.

²¹*On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992) 75-78. Also, cf. Walter Wink, “Jesus’ Reply to John: Matt 11.2-6/Luke 7.18-35,” *Forum* 5 (1989) 121-28.

of those associated with the Messiah.²² Roth goes on to comment on the rhetorical style of the narrative in the speech, one representative of brevity, rhyming, and rhythm that heightens the import of Jesus' words. *Contra* these investigative attempts, I contend that much more can be said regarding the rhetorical texture of the speech. Further, except for passing reference to the characterization of John the Baptist, such as that by Darr, analyses of the speech do not consider larger issues such as plot, characterization, and thematic motifs (*topoi*).

1.4 Fourth Galilean Speech (8.4-18)

Presently, the rhetorical texture of the speech in 8.4-18 has not been surveyed in terms of ancient rhetoric, and most interpretive endeavors give little heed to its connection to the larger narrative discourse; the majority of inquiries simply focus on its coherence as an internal unit and analeptic and proleptic echoes. In contrast, much more attention has been paid to its corollary in Mark 4.1-35. Mary Ann Tolbert, most notably, argues that it is the primary key for "unlocking" the construal of characterization throughout the Markan narrative discourse, providing a grid from which individual characters and character groups are evaluated.²³ A corresponding evaluation of the Lukan successor has not been made, however. It is my contention that the speech, though its overall role and significance is slightly less in terms of the overall narrative discourse, serves a comparable function in Luke-Acts.

²²*Character Types*, 173-77.

²³*Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989) 148-64; idem, "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character," *Interpretation* 47 (1993) 347-57.

2 INVESTIGATION OF THE NARRATIVE DISCOURSE OF LUKE-ACTS

Emergence of interest in New Criticism in the cloak of composition and narrative criticism – with a smattering of publications in the 1970s and a dramatic growth in the 1980s and early 1990s – and subsequently reader-response criticism – beginning in the 1980s and extending into the 1990s – elicited a burgeoning interest in plot and characterization in biblical narrative.²⁴ Inquiries into the narrative of Luke-Acts dates back to Charles H. Talbert and Norman Petersen in the 1970s. Talbert, under the descriptive term of “architectural analysis,” argues that Luke-Acts is connected by structural patterns, such as parallelisms, chiasmic arrangements, and other literary devices. He supplements his work with what he designates as “genre criticism,” comparing the structural patterns of Luke-Acts with characteristics of biographical accounts of philosophers from Greco-Roman antiquity.²⁵ Petersen approaches the narrative of Luke-Acts from the perspective of poetic function – utilizing the work of Roman Jakobson as his methodological basis – focusing on how linear elements and repetitive cycles form the narrative’s plot.²⁶

Beginning with Robert C. Tannehill, scholarship began to move towards a more encompassing methodology deemed “narrative criticism.”²⁷ These investigations examine narrative as an interactive whole in terms of plot lines, gaps, redundancies,

²⁴For an overview of literary investigation of the narrative in Luke-Acts, see F. Scott Spencer, “Acts and Modern Literary Approaches,” in *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, 381-414.

²⁵*Literary Patterns*; idem, *Reading Luke*; idem, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Book of Acts* [New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1984]).

²⁶*Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (New Testament Series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978) 81-92.

²⁷*Unity of Luke-Acts*, 2 vols.

characterization, irony, narrative points of view, and more – terminology drawn from the secular literary practice known as “narratology.”²⁸ Subsequent permutations of narrative criticism delve into aspects of reader-response criticism, whereby the extratext – historical and social information of the milieu from which Luke-Acts derives – is melded with intratextual features from which the implied reader builds plot and characterization.²⁹ Recently, Lukan scholarship has seen a smattering of attempts to read the narrative in terms of ideological discourse and deconstruction, though such is yet to make significant inroads into the bulk of scholarly discussion.³⁰

2.1 Formalism Lays the Foundation: Narrative Criticism

Tannehill is perhaps one of the first scholars to broach issues related to plot and characterization in Luke-Acts. His construction of characterization is from the standpoint of narratology, primarily focusing on intratextual elements – such as narrative point of view, repetition, and type scenes – with a sporadic mention of intertextual referents.³¹ Based on the underlying premise that Jesus serves as the protagonist in the narrative, he references the existence of different character groups –

²⁸E.g., Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. Christine van Boheemen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).

²⁹Much has been written in this area during the past decade and a half (see Todd Penner, “Contextualizing Acts,” in *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele [Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series, 20; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003] 1-22; Joseph B. Tyson, “From History to Rhetoric and Back: Assessing New Trends in Acts Studies,” in *Contextualizing Acts*, 23-42; Spencer, “Literary Approaches,” 396-405, 410-14).

³⁰The most prominent work in this area is that of Stephen D. Moore, *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspectives: Jesus Begins to Write* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Most recently, Jonathan Knight, *Luke's Gospel* (New Testament Readings; New York and London: Routledge Press, 1998) 147-60.

³¹*Unity of Luke-Acts*, 2 vols.

as per their relationship to Jesus. He notes, in particular, an ongoing predilection in the narrative to introduce characters who figure prominently later in the narrative as minor characters. Individuals such as Mary Magdalene, Barnabas, Stephen, Philip, Saul, and James make their entrance into the story in this manner. He also envisions a close relationship between plot and characterization, with characterization subservient to plot, helping to move the narrative along to a closure. Hence, characterization is construed in terms of how characters respond to Jesus in Luke and subsequently his followers in Acts. Tannehill breaks Lukan characterization into categories that parallel several major character groups that appear throughout the narrative of Luke-Acts – the crowds or people, the Jewish authorities, the disciples, and followers.

In regard to the plot of Luke-Acts, Tannehill argues that it revolves around the purpose of God, a dynamic force adjusting to recurrent conflicts and the arrival of new opportunities. Lk 4.16-30 is programmatic, which Tannehill believes establishes the basis for Jesus' ministry and message and then that of the early church. Specifically, Tannehill identifies the tragic characterization of Israel as the overarching plot line, noting that the prior promises of salvation to Israel are left unfulfilled.³² Regarding the characterization of the disciples, he argues that the faults of the disciples in Luke are overcome in the narrative of Acts by those who adhere to Jesus' message and ministry as espoused in Luke. The crowds essentially serve as a means for moving the narrative forward and, for the most part, are depicted in a positive light. The rejection of Jesus by the crowd before Pilate at the end of Luke, as a result, is a tragic mistake – one of

³²“Israel in Luke-Acts,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985) 69-85; idem, “Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul’s Mission in Acts,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1986 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1986) 130-41.

pity and fear at tragic error. The final group he identifies, the marginal and oppressed, encompass a potpourri of characters that appear and then disappear.

Tannehill's inquiry is helpful in that it establishes a foundation for further investigation into characterization in Luke-Acts. He recognizes the importance of Jesus' initial speech in Lk 4.16-30 for the construction of plot and characterization throughout the rest of the narrative. He, however, only makes passing reference to the two speeches in Lk 6.17-49 and 8.4-18 and no reference to the one in 7.24-35 in relationship to the larger issues of narrative discourse. Further, his discussion is primarily oriented towards intratextual features, with sparse references to intertextual connections and echoes and little mention of extratextual connotations.³³

Almost the opposite is true of David Gowler's examination of the Pharisees.³⁴ He employs a methodological approach consisting of a mixture of literary features – ancient and modern – and cultural scenarios. Nevertheless, though he does demonstrate a significant awareness of literary theory, he fails to formulate a methodological framework for his investigation, becoming lost in the details of cultural codes that dominate the bulk of his analysis. Perhaps the biggest downfall of his analysis is the lack of a framework for sequential construction on the part of the reader, giving precedence to cultural codes over preceding data in the narrative that

³³This is the criticism of Spencer, "Literary Approaches," 393-96, 413-14. However, Tannehill moves in a direction that accounts for intertextuality and extratextual referents in some of his recent publications (e.g., *Luke* [Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996] esp. 27-31).

³⁴*Host, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts* (Emory Studies in Early Christianity, 2; New York: Peter Lang, 1991). Also, cf. his "Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach," *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 19 (1989) 57-62.

might determine construction of plot and characterization.³⁵ This leads him to conclude that the characterization of the Pharisees in Luke is largely negative, whereas their characterization in Acts is mostly positive. This incongruence in characterization results from a lack of methodological coherence and consistency.

Mark Allan Powell argues that the religious leaders (Sadducees, Pharisees, lawyers, scribes, et al.) form a distinct character group, with the similarities outweighing the differences of the individual constituents.³⁶ He subsequently contends that the character trait of self-righteousness pervades the characterization of the religious leaders throughout the narrative. He also suggests that the characterization of the religious leaders is not absolute, concluding that individual characters, such as Zechariah and Joseph of Arimathea, embody characteristics counter to representations elsewhere in the narrative. The strongest aspect of Powell's argument pertains to his delineation of various character traits attributed to the religious leaders. His examination of the narrative, however, largely does not treat issues beyond characterization of the Pharisees. In addition, his inquiry stops at the end of Luke and does not consider the effects of the narrative discourse of Acts on the characterization of the religious leaders.³⁷

Jack Dean Kingsbury pinpoints two separate plot lines: one pertaining to the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish authorities and the other to that between Jesus

³⁵For a criticism of Gowler's methodological approach, see Darr, *Character Building*, 187n.4, 190-91n.24.

³⁶"The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990) 93-110; idem, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 61, 63, 65, 67.

³⁷Powell ("Religious Leaders in Luke," 108) seemingly believes the characterization of the religious leaders in Luke remains the same in the narrative of Acts.

and the disciples.³⁸ The former plot line revolves around the question of authority – that is, whether Jesus and his followers or the Jewish authorities have the right to lead a reconstituted Israel. The latter plot line involves the inability of the disciples to recognize Jesus and embody actions representative of his teaching. Kingsbury acknowledges that the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish authorities continues in Acts, with the Jewish authorities remaining as the antagonists and the followers of Jesus simply replacing him as the main protagonists in the narrative.³⁹ The plot line representing the struggle between Jesus and his disciples comes to a completion at the end of Luke and ceases to exist in Acts. Kingsbury also performs a brief overview of the crowds and people as one character group, concluding that while they are well-disposed towards Jesus, they lack the faith required to respond in an appropriate manner.⁴⁰ There are a number of minor characters in the narrative as well, which Kingsbury argues serve either as foils for other characters or as examples of negative or positive traits.⁴¹ While informative, Kingsbury's analysis is exceedingly formalistic in its approach and embodies weaknesses similar to those of Tannehill, demonstrating detailed attention to literary aspects while showing little concern for intertextual matters and no regard for extratextual connotations.

³⁸*Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) *passim*; idem, "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus," *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 369-78.

³⁹"The Pharisees in Luke-Acts," in *The Four Gospels 1992*, vol. 2, ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et al. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 1497-1511.

⁴⁰*Conflict in Luke*, 28-31. Also, cf. Joseph B. Tyson, "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984) 574-83.

⁴¹*Conflict in Luke*, 31-34.

Combining historical criticism and narrative criticism – with the latter including intertextuality – in a series of articles and essays, Swiss scholar Daniel Marguerat addresses various aspects of the narrative of Luke-Acts.⁴² In regard to methodology, he concludes that Luke-Acts “must be evaluated according to the *point of view of the historian* which controls the writing of the narrative, the *truth* that the author aims to communicate, and *the need for identity* to which the work of the historian responds.”⁴³ Through his analysis of the narrative discourse, he contends that the portrayal of the Jewish people and interactions within the Christian community on the topic of Jewish-Gentile relations reflect a post-70 C.E. readership wrestling with issues of identity and animosity between Jews and Gentiles. He further proposes that the presence of various descriptions with dual meanings – one for a Jewish readership and another for a Gentile readership – points in the direction of a mixed ethnic readership for Luke-Acts. Specifically, Marguerat proposes that separation of the early church from the Jewish synagogue had already taken place for the readership, and this reality prompts much of the rhetoric typically identified as anti-Semitic in the narrative discourse. Regarding Acts, Marguerat contends that the narrative presents the ideal social setting as having both Jews and Christians living in harmony with each other (citing the school of Tyrannus and the house of Paul in Rome as corroboration).

Central to Marguerat’s investigative approach is his construal of the enigmatic ending in Acts 28.17-31, and his contention that narrative closure must be completed

⁴²A compilation of Marguerat’s essays and articles originally appeared in French – *La première histoire du Christianisme (Actes des apôtres)* (Lectio Divina, 180; Paris, Cerf, and Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1999). An English translation was published in 2002 – *The First Christian Historian: Writing the ‘Acts of the Apostles’* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 121; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

⁴³*Christian Historian*, 6-7.

by the reader. Context for the conclusion is established by the preceding narrative scenes: Acts 27 presents Paul in heroic deliverance from evil powers (using the Greco-Roman sea voyage type scene); Acts 28.1-16 attests a chain of events that demonstrate divine favor towards Paul; and Acts 28.17-28 is an inverted trial, one in which Paul (rather than his accusers) summons the defense. Marguerat subsequently concludes that the enigmatic ending – resembling a rhetorical device found in other Greco-Roman narrative designated as “narrative suspension” – is an attempt by the implied author to reinterpret Paul’s martyrdom by inverting the structure of the expected trial and moreover perpetuating his missionary work to the present.⁴⁴

Of all European continental scholars, Marguerat presents the most thorough literary investigation of Luke-Acts.⁴⁵ His examination falls short in that it does not probe beyond narrative texture, with little or no interest in the presence of sociological systems and ways in which the narrative discourse is appropriated by readers. In addition, he does not consider the entirety of the narrative of Luke-Acts, but rather focuses on select sections – primarily contained within Acts.

2.2 Initial Queries Beyond Formalism: Sociological Explorations

Phillip Esler, combining social-science and redaction criticisms, contends social and political factors, rather than theological issues, shape the narrative discourse of

⁴⁴Originally presented in “The End of Acts (28,16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 74-89. Also, “The Enigma of the Silent Closing of Acts (28:16-31),” in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 284-304.

⁴⁵Also, cf. the literary approach of J.-N. Aletti, *Quand Luc raconte: Le récit comme théologie* (Lire la Bible, 115; Paris: Cerf, 1998).

Luke-Acts.⁴⁶ He reaches three general conclusions regarding the readership of Luke-Acts. First, he finds that Luke-Acts addresses a readership in need of legitimization in contradistinction to the Jewish synagogue and wider Hellenistic society. The readership consists of Jewish and Gentile Christians, with the latter deriving from the ranks of Godfearers. The thematic motif of table fellowship serves as the basis for corroborating solidarity between Jews and Gentiles – both for the narrative audience and for the actual readership. Second, for Roman Christians, the narrative discourse provides reassurance that Christianity is not incompatible with allegiance to Rome. Finally, in regard to the motif of material benefaction, Esler suggests the readership of Luke-Acts was experiencing social stratification and economic disparity, a situation threatening their fellowship. For corroboration, he identifies the paraenetic emphasis in the narrative discourse surrounding the importance of material benefaction from the rich to the poor.

While widely acknowledged for demonstrating the importance of sociological interpretation for Lukan studies, Esler's methodological approach has been criticized on various fronts. Foremost is his assumption that each major theme of the narrative discourse represents issues confronting a hypothetical sectarian community; it is fallacious to conclude that a narrative focus explicitly reveals a problem facing the readership. A second problem concerns Esler's tendency to portray early Christianity

⁴⁶*Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lukan Theology* (Society of New Testament Monograph Series, 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

in terms of a purely defined sect-church typology; an approach that is too simplistic and delineates a static, formalistic sociological composition.⁴⁷

Though much of European continental scholarship remains focused on source and redactional issues, several scholars have pushed their investigative approaches beyond formalistic methodological parameters. In addition to Betz's in-depth rhetorical analysis of the Lukan Sermon on the Plain (Lk 6.20-49),⁴⁸ several German scholars have explored elements of Greco-Roman rhetoric in relationship to the larger Lukan narrative discourse.⁴⁹ Scandinavian scholar Halvor Moxnes, like Esler, utilizes social-scientific criticism to pinpoint various aspects of the social system of the Lukan implied readership.⁵⁰ He concludes that the question of material benefaction forms a central theme, with a call to enact economic redistribution in which the needy are cared for and the wealthy give without expectation of return. The Pharisees stand in contradistinction to this reciprocity ethic, in that they are characterized by the implied author as using material benefaction as a means of achieving higher social status. Moxnes further asserts that Luke-Acts addresses both a Jewish- and Hellenistic-

⁴⁷For this criticism, see Stephen C. Barton, "Sociology and Theology," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998) 469. Also, cf. his earlier examination of the sect-church taxonomy ("Early Christianity and the Sociology of the Sect," in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?*, ed. Francis Watson [London: SCM Press, 1993] 140-62).

⁴⁸*Sermon on the Mount*, 571-640.

⁴⁹Specifically, Manfred Diefenbach, *Die Komposition des Lukasevangeliums unter Berücksichtigung antiker Rhetorikamente* (Frankfurter theologische Studien; Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knacht, 1993); Robert Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian: Rhetorik als Erzählkunst* (Zurich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1993).

⁵⁰*The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Overtures in Biblical Theology; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988); idem, "Social Relations and Economic Interaction in Luke's Gospel," in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. Peter Luomanen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 58-75.

Christian readership, one searching to resolve questions involving the social interaction of the two ethnic groups.⁵¹ In regard to the issue of women, he asserts that their depiction in the Lukan narrative – portrayed as independent of their husbands, with means of their own – serves as a prescription for women as disciples, though the representation is based on male ideals. Moxnes subsequently concludes that meal settings for the Christian community serve as the means in Luke-Acts (and thus for the readership) for the break with traditional social systems related to benefaction, honor and shame, and ethnicity. Despite moving the discussion involving the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts in the direction of new vistas, Moxnes' analysis is limited in that he primarily focuses on Luke with only passing attention paid to the narrative of Acts. Similarly, the scope of his investigation is restricted, as he merely looks at one (viz., material benefaction) of a number of narrative threads.

2.3 Moving Beyond Formalism: Integrating Reader-Response Criticism

Addressing the dynamic voice of narrator, William S. Kurz proposes that Luke-Acts consists of four different narrators that operate in solidarity with each other to produce a unified narrative.⁵² In particular, his examination of Luke-Acts is perhaps the most comprehensive in terms of plot in that he suggests that three separate plot lines constitute the narrative – promise and fulfillment, conflict, and the journey motif – all

⁵¹Specifically, see “The Social Context of Luke’s Community,” *Interpretation* 49 (1994) 379-89.

⁵²*Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993); also, cf. “Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts,” *Biblica* 68 (1987) 195-220. Kurz identifies four narrators in Luke-Acts: (1) *histor*, “I” in the prologue of Luke; (2) an unobtrusive, omniscient narrator speaking in the third person through most of Luke-Acts; (3) a marginal observant and participant, “we” narrator appearing in sections of Acts after 16.10; and (4) character voices of stories within stories such as the call conversion narratives of Paul in Acts 22 and 26.

of which move the narrative along to a closure. In particular, he argues that the implied author uses Sir 48.1-16 to establish all three plot lines via intertextual allusions, contending that the pattern of Israel rejecting both prophet and successor and hence being evicted from its land – as found in Sir 48.1-16 – parallels the Lukan portrayal of the Jewish rejection of Jesus and his apostolic successors.⁵³ In regard to characterization in Luke-Acts, Kurz proposes that the implied author draws on Hellenistic rhetorical conventions, creating characterization that provides both positive and negative examples of behavior.⁵⁴ Kurz's approach to Luke-Acts is helpful in that it demonstrates how the narrative discourse embodies paradigmatic frameworks found elsewhere in Greco-Roman narrative – in terms of characterization, structure, and argument – and how the implied author uses these to shape the rhetorical discourse of the narrative. Indeed, in many ways Kurz moves the scholarly investigation of Luke-Acts further than his narrative and response-response contemporaries by going beyond narrative texture to ideological underpinnings of the implied author via identification of intertextual connections – both LXX and extra-biblical. The weakness of Kurz's approach is in his demarcation of the implied reader as a one-dimensional textual construct and lack of attention to ideological issues related to the narrative discourse. In contrast, as I will discuss in greater detail in chapter two, recent research on the audiences of Greco-Roman narrative calls for a much more complex, multi-dimensional understanding of the appropriation process.

⁵³“Intertextual Use of Sir. 48.1-16 in Plotting Luke-Acts,” in *The Gospels and Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 308-24.

⁵⁴“Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts,” in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 171-89.

In probably the most thorough-going study of characterization in Luke-Acts and, perhaps, all the New Testament, John A. Darr proposes that characterization is a construction of the authorial audience, which builds characterization vis-à-vis a sequential compilation of intratextual referents, coupled with intertextual allusions and extratextual details.⁵⁵ He concludes that the evaluation of characters in Luke-Acts is predicated on perception and response: certain characters understand Jesus' message or that of his followers and act upon that understanding, while other characters – though they carefully observe the words of Jesus or his followers – remain unperceptive and, as a result, fail to act. He focuses on three different character groups: John the Baptist, the paradigmatic model for response to Jesus; the Pharisees, the paradigmatic prototype of everything the implied author rejects; and King Herod, the embodiment of tyrants – biblical and extra-biblical.⁵⁶ Darr's investigation of the narrative discourse is the most complete at this point, incorporating intratextual data, intertextual echoes, and extratextual codes into its construction of characterization. His analysis falls short in three areas: (1) it only considers three different character groups; (2) its methodological basis on the reading process, as dictated by anticipation, is flawed (viz., he does not consider retrospection as a valid activity);⁵⁷ and (3) it does

⁵⁵*Character Building, passim.*

⁵⁶On the latter character type, see John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 163; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) *passim*.

⁵⁷Green criticizes Darr's categorical reading of the Pharisees, arguing that he fails to account for the possibility that the reading process is both anticipatory and retrospective, thus providing the means for reevaluation of character groups (*Gospel of Luke*, 301-02, 307, 537; idem, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* [New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995] 72-75). Darr responds with the contention that anticipatory effects of the reading process takes precedence over that of retrospection and, hence, subsequent characterization of the Pharisees is colored by that which comes before in the narrative ("Irenic

not move beyond formalism to account for the ideological effects of characterization on the authorial audience.⁵⁸

Roth draws upon Darr's methodological approach, arguing that intratextual, intertextual, and extratextual information assists the authorial audience in constructing the character group of the blind, lame, and poor.⁵⁹ He suggests that Jesus' inaugural speech in Lk 4.14-30 establishes the foundation and that the LXX supplies the intertextual repertoire. Through repetition in the narrative, the authorial audience builds a stereotype for a character group that typically remains anonymous, powerless, and vulnerable. This character group is to be distinguished from the sinners. Specifically, Roth contends that the authorial audience would be predisposed to a sympathetic reaction to a character group embodying characteristics of the blind, lame, and poor, but antipathetic towards sinners. Jesus' programmatic ministry to the former character group corroborates the implied author's equation of Jesus as the Messiah. The character group disappears in Acts because its existence is no longer necessary. Threads between Luke and Acts remain, however, as Jesus' ministry to the character group of the sinners is paralleled in the ministry of the apostles. Roth pinpoints a number of very interesting insights regarding the narrative discourse in relationship to characterization. The primary weakness revolves around his construct of a one-dimensional audience and disinterest in examining potential ways of appropriation by

or Ironic? Another Look at Gamaliel before the Sanhedrin [Acts 5:33-42]," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998] 133n.33).

⁵⁸Darr is one of the first biblical scholars to adopt the heuristic construct of "authorial audience" versus that of "implied reader," though his classification is essentially semantic, in that his "reader" remains a one-dimensional construct.

⁵⁹*Character Types, passim.*

the authorial reader. In addition, *contra* Roth, interest by the implied author in the stereotypical character group (deemed as the “marginalized”) does not completely fall from purview in the narrative of Acts (cf. 2.41-47; 4.32-5.11; 6.1-7; 9.36-43; 11.27-30).

2.4 Other Narrative, Sociological, Reader-Response Investigations

Various studies on the characterization of God, Peter, Paul, and even the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts have appeared over the past decade. Two other significant areas of examination revolve around identification of narrative redundancies and type scenes and their overarching impact on the narrative discourse, on the one hand, and intertextual connections with extra-biblical texts, on the other. These essentially parallel the above studies, to varying degrees, espousing methodological approaches that consider intratextual, extratextual, and intertextual features. I will recount some of the more influential.

2.4.1 Characterization

Robert L. Brawley and William H. Shepherd, Jr. attempt to construct characterization for the divine. Despite detailed narrative analysis, both are largely unsuccessful. Brawley traces the characterization of God throughout the narrative of Luke-Acts, but concludes the character of God is elusive and difficult to fix from the narrative.⁶⁰ Shepherd argues from a framework similar to that of Brawley, except – rather than construing the Holy Spirit as embodiment of God in the earthly realm – he proposes that the Holy Spirit and God are two separate characters, with the Holy

⁶⁰*Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990) 111-24. Also, see his “The God of Promises and the News in Luke-Acts,” in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, 279-96.

Spirit as the on-stage representative of God.⁶¹ However, as Brawley argues, Shepherd's proposed dichotomy between God and the Holy Spirit is questionable.⁶² The most compelling investigation around the characterization of God and the Holy Spirit is that of François Bovon. He does not demarcate a boundary between God and the Holy Spirit, contending that the implied author constructs a new aspect of the characterization of God in Luke-Acts, one in which God becomes a God of all – ceasing to be a God of direct descendants only.⁶³ The intervention of God in the narrative does not obviate human responsibility: divine providence does not control human actions, but rather God provides direction through human mediations – which, through prayer, are open to divine direction.⁶⁴

Attempts to construct characterization of Peter and Paul are more persuasive in their argumentation than the aforementioned. Characterization of Peter in Luke-Acts has received less attention than that in Mark, Matthew, and even John. In Luke-Acts, the tragic downfall of Peter is reversed in Acts, where he ascends to an exemplary status. This is made possible by means of the resurrection, which enables the disciples to gain a full understanding of Jesus' message and subsequently act upon it. His words and deeds in Acts parallel those of Jesus in Luke, thereby leading the reader to the

⁶¹*The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 147; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). Also, cf. Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* [Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 211; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001].

⁶²"God of Promises," 280-81.

⁶³"The God of Luke," in *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 36; Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick, 1995) 67-80.

⁶⁴"The Importance of Mediations in Luke's Theological Plan," in *New Testament Traditions*, 51-66. For a similar approach to the characterization of God and the Holy Spirit, cf. Marguerat, *Christian Historian*, 85-108.

conclusion that Jesus' ministry continues in the form of early church leaders such as Peter.⁶⁵ Characterization of Paul has been the subject of several monographs and articles over the past several years. John C. Lentz draws on rhetorical categories to construct a characterization of Paul, concluding that Paul garners a status of respect when viewed from the lens of classical virtues of Greco-Roman antiquity.⁶⁶ Jerome H. Neyrey proposes a similar conclusion vis-à-vis a reading of Paul's characterization from the standpoint of social status.⁶⁷

In a recent examination of characterization of Jewish believers in the Book of Acts, Richard P. Thompson suggests the narrative discourse of Acts prompts readers to compare the depiction of the Jewish-Christian believers to that of the Jewish religious leaders.⁶⁸ He finds that Jewish-Christian believers are shown as faithful to the Jewish law and religious practices, among those whom the presence of God is found, united in the face of controversy, and forthright in helping those who are in material and/or spiritual need. The portrayal of the Jewish religious leaders is in contradistinction: beyond the presence of God, united together in jealousy and

⁶⁵See, e.g., David P. Moessner, "'The Christ must suffer': New Light on the Jesus-Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts," *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986) 220-56; Robert W. Wall, "Successors to the 'Twelve' according to Acts 12.1-17," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53 (1991) 628-43.

⁶⁶*Luke's Portrait of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) *passim*.

⁶⁷"Luke's Social Location of Paul: Cultural Anthropology and the Status of Paul in Acts," in *History, Literature, and Society*, 251-79. Also, cf. the argument of Marie-Eloise Rosenblatt that the characterization of Paul is two-fold: the heroic apostle to the Gentiles, as the equal of Peter (based on the parallels between the ministries of Peter and Paul), and, on the other hand, the archetypal representative for beleaguered missionary teachers (*Paul the Accused: His Portrait in the Acts of the Apostles* [Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995]).

⁶⁸*Christian Community and Characterization in the Book of Acts: A Literary Study of the Lukan Concept of the Church* (Ph.D diss., Southern Methodist University, 1996) *passim*; idem, "Believers and Religious Leaders in Jerusalem: Contrasting Portraits of Jews in Acts 1-7," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, 327-44.

opposition to Jewish-Christian believers, and a divisive group intent on dividing the Jewish people. Thompson lays the groundwork for his investigation with a thorough methodological discussion that spans the spectrum from ancient rhetoric to modern reading theories. The first problem with his analysis is his limited focus – characterization of the Christian community in Acts – while the second involves the formalistic nature of his study, as he only touches on the plausible effects of the narrative upon the recipients of Luke-Acts and largely does not look at the ways in which such might impact the appropriation by the authorial audience (to which Thompson refers in terms of the “implied reader”).

2.4.2 Investigation of Narrative Redundancies and Intertextuality

Interest in understanding the various redundancies scattered throughout the narrative of Luke-Acts dates back to the groundbreaking work of Talbert. His inquiry not only addresses intertextual parallels but intratextual parallels, with the former focusing on structural and thematic correspondence, on the one hand, between the ministries of Elijah and Elisha and that of Jesus and, on the other hand, narrative patterns that extend from Jesus, to Peter, to Paul.⁶⁹ This concern in repetition extends to structural redundancies in the narrative – an aspect that has received increased attention over the past decade. The bulk of attention is on the two versions of the “Conversion of Cornelius” in Acts 10-11⁷⁰ and the three versions of “Saul’s

⁶⁹*Literary Patterns, passim*. Also, Susan Marie Praeder, “Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul, and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Response,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984) 23-39.

⁷⁰Ronald D. Witherup, “Cornelius Over and Over Again: ‘Functional Redundancy’ in the Acts of the Apostles,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 49 (1993) 45-66; William S. Kurz, “Effects of Variant Narrators in Acts 10-11,” *New Testament Studies* 43

Conversion” in Acts 9, 22, and 26.⁷¹ Variants in the repetitive scenes serve different rhetorical purposes for the implied author in shaping the narrative discourse. While these investigations prove quite valuable in understanding the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts better, they fall short in moving beyond the boundaries of author and text to that of reader.

There is increasing recognition that Luke-Acts – particularly the narrative of Acts – contains not only numerous intertextual connections and echoes with the LXX but various intertextual connections with extra-biblical narrative. While the preponderance of most initial queries into this assertion concentrate on Acts 27.1-28.10,⁷² a number expand the investigation to a much broader expanse of texts. These queries pinpoint a greater degree of potential meanings through the presence of this expanded intertextuality.⁷³ In particular, the appropriation of these intertextual connections – both in the congruence and incongruence of the texts – by the implied

(1997) 570-86.

⁷¹Ronald D. Witherup, “Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 48 (1992) 67-86; Daniel Marguerat, “Saul’s Conversion (Acts 9-22-26) and the Multiplication of Narrative in Acts,” in *Luke’s Literary Achievement*, ed. Christopher Tuckett (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 127-55. Also, see David Lertis Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 123; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), who contends Jesus’ speech to the seventy disciples in Lk 10.1-24 establishes a household conversion pattern that is replicated throughout Acts.

⁷²See, e.g., Susan Marie Praeder, “Acts 27,1-28.16: Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984) 683-706.

⁷³Perhaps the most notable is the work of Dennis R. MacDonald, “Luke’s Emulation of Homer: Acts 12:1-17 and Illiad 24,” *Forum* 3 (2000) 197-205; idem, “The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul,” *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999) 88-107; idem, “Luke’s Eutychus and Homer’s Elphenor: Acts 20:7-12 and Odyssey 10-12,” *Journal for Higher Criticism* 1 (1994) 4-24.

reader produces new meaning encompassing issues within the narrative such as plot, characterization, and thematic motifs.

2.5 Embracing An Integrated Hermeneutic: Ideological Systems and Location

Approaches to the narrative discourse through narrative criticism and reader-response criticism lay the foundation for recent investigations that aim to move beyond the textual surface to deeper nuances ranging from ideological systems embraced or repudiated by the implied author to ways in which the narrative discourse might shape the social, gender, and political systems of the plausible recipients of the two-volume work. One of the first to move the discussion in this direction is Joseph B. Tyson. Though his initial work focuses on narrative nuances of Luke-Acts – which is most known for its analysis of the Jewish people⁷⁴ – his latter work aims to disclose the ideological location of the implied reader and the potential ways in which the implied reader might construe the narrative discourse.⁷⁵ Tyson concludes, based on seven observations about the implied reader that he gleans via a close reading of the Lukan text, that the implied reader most closely coincides with the personages designated as Godfearers. He specifically argues that the various Godfearers in the narrative stand as “intratextual representations of the implied reader” in Luke-Acts.⁷⁶ The primary effect

⁷⁴See, e.g., “Jewish Public,” 574-83.

⁷⁵Specifically, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992) esp. 19-41; idem, “Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer,” *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 19-38. Cf. Vernon K. Robbins (“The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models of Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishing, 1991] 305-32), who employs a similar methodological approach in demarcating the “social location” of the implied author, though he does not restrict the identification of the implied reader to Godfearers.

⁷⁶*Images of Judaism*, 37.

of the narrative discourse, which Tyson sees as anti-Semitic based on his understanding of the characterization of the Jewish people, is to wean the implied reader away from any tendencies to associate with Jews and to convince the implied reader that Christianity – versus Judaism – embodies the values that initially led the implied reader to embrace Judaism. While notable in his attempt to move the discussion of Luke-Acts beyond formalism, Tyson's argument falls short in regard to its methodological underpinnings. On the one hand, a predisposition by the implied author to favor Godfearers via positive characterization and an extratextual repertoire that coincides with the ideological location of an implied reader are not adequate evidence for the implied reader to be deemed as a Godfearer. On the other hand, as will be discussed in greater detail in chapter two, the processes associated with the publication of Greco-Roman narratives, which resulted in a broad distribution through literary patronage, remonstrates against identification of a one-dimensional, analogous group of recipients.

Günter Wasserberg builds upon the work of Kingsbury, Tannehill, and Tyson – on the ethnicity of the readership and the ideological nature of the narrative discourse – by combining synchronic and diachronic concerns.⁷⁷ Unlike the main of German scholarship, which largely concentrates on source, redactional, and historical elements,⁷⁸ Wasserberg focuses on narrative and readerly aspects. He argues that these help reveal ideological systems and ways in which they shape the narrative discourse of

⁷⁷*Aus Israels Mitte – Heil für die Welt: Eine narrativ-exegetische Studie zur Theologie des Lukas* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 92; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998).

⁷⁸See, e.g., Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 2 vols., 3d ed. (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; Freiburg: Herder, 1994).

Luke-Acts. As Luke-Acts shows significant interest in portraying certain Jews in a positive light,⁷⁹ Wasserberg argues that Tyson's designation of the implied reader ("impliziten Leserkreise") as a Godfearer is too exclusive and does not accurately reflect the narrative discourse when it is considered in its entirety. Consequently, he suggests that the intended readership ("intendierten Leserkreis") encompasses a much broader matrix – both Gentiles and Jews already instructed in the Christian message.

Wasserberg goes on to suggest that the narrative of Acts must account for the interpretive models set forth in Luke and the various redundancies and parallels that exist between the two works. He identifies "salvation of God to all peoples" as the primary theological theme of Luke-Acts – initially demarcated by Simeon (Lk 2.29-35) and then elaborated upon throughout the narrative. In regard to the depiction of the Jewish people, Wasserberg asserts that it is inaccurate to categorize the narrative of Luke-Acts as anti-Semitic, pointing out that the representation of the Pharisees is ambivalent, with the Pharisees absent from the Jewish groups present at Jesus' trial and crucifixion (Lk 22-23) and even coming to the defense of the Christian movement at

⁷⁹See Wasserberg's comments (*Israels Mitte*, 64-65):

Die von Lukas intendierte Adressatenschaft kann, wie wir oben gesehen haben, nicht allein auf den Kreis >Gott fürchtender< ἔθνη beschränkt werden. Zwar ist durchaus ein erzählerisches Gefälle in Lk-Act von Juden hin zu ἔθνη, zumal solchen, die sich explizit gottesfürchtig verhalten, zu beobachten, aber daraus zu folgern, in letzteren *allein* den von Lukas intendierten Leserkreis auszumachen, überseht die positive Zeichnung auch *judenchristlicher* (Petrus; Paulus) und selbst *jüdischer* (z.B. Zacharias Lk 1; Siemon Lk 2) Frömmigkeit. Sind solche judenchristlichen Frömmigkeitsprofile wie das der Urgemeinde inklusive Pauli lediglich eine – nunmehr obsolete – Vorstufe heidenchristlicher Frömmigkeit? Ein narrativ-exegetisches Herangehen, das dem gesamten Erzählduktus Rechnig tragen will, muß *alle* möglichen impliziten Leserkreise in Erwägung ziehen, folglich auch Judenchristen.

various junctures (Acts 5.33-39; 22.3; 23.1-10).⁸⁰ In addition, he argues that the close of Acts (28.17-31) is open-ended, with “salvation of God” available to all people who embrace the Christian message – both Jew and Gentile.⁸¹

Wasserberg’s examination of Luke-Acts is a valuable contribution in that it pushes the discussion of implied reader and the “hypothetical/intended” readership beyond the formalistic parameters of the text. The most glaring weakness of his investigation is his failure to delimit a clear methodological approach. While he includes a section on methodology, he does not build the basis for his methodological inquiry via primary literature but rather via secondary sources. As such, he merely overviews the interpretive approaches of Kingsbury, Tannehill, and Tyson – specifically in regard to narrative elements such as plot, characterization, and implied reader – and posits the need for a methodological approach that includes both synchronic and diachronic concerns.⁸² On a similar note, his methodological foundation is deficient in that issues central to a narrative investigation with the implied reader in purview such as repetition (verbal to type scenes), intertextuality, extratextual repertoire, point of view, and so forth are absent. A third issue pertains to his lack of interest in exploring sociological aspects of the narrative – specifically how such might affect appropriation of the narrative by the implied reader. Finally, as Wasserberg’s analysis focuses on the demarcation of the narrative topic of “salvation of God to all peoples” and its relationship to the question concerning whether the narrative

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 179-90.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 71-115, 352-54.

⁸²*Ibid.*, 32-35.

discourse is anti-Semitic, it does not encompass the narrative of Luke-Acts in its entirety.

One of the most comprehensive methodological approaches to Luke-Acts is that of Joel B. Green, who integrates hermeneutical frameworks from new historicism⁸³ – from which he seeks to gain deeper insights into the ideological nuances of the narrative discourse and its meaning-making potentials – with narrative and reader-response criticisms. Coinciding with what he designates “discourse analysis” (taken from the field of linguistics), he breaks his investigative approach into three areas: (1) *co-text* – string of linguistic data within which the text is set (viz., intratextuality); (2) *intertext* – location of the text within the larger linguistic frame of reference on which it consciously or unconsciously draws for meaning (viz., intertextuality); and (3) *context* – the socio-historical realities to which the text gives witness as well as that of the narrative itself (viz., extratextuality).⁸⁴ Integral to Green’s methodological approach is his understanding of the reading process as both prospective and retrospective – the reader projects expectations while concurrently re-examining prior events. Also important to Green’s hermeneutical framework is a recognition that the narrative discourse feeds theological discovery, which, in the case of Luke-Acts, Green posits as “Salvation to the Ends of the Earth” as the overarching

⁸³For an overview, see, e.g., Paul Hamilton, *Historicism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996) 150-204.

⁸⁴*Gospel of Luke*, 11-20. For an in-depth overview of “discourse analysis,” see his “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Interpretation,” in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995) 175-96.

theme,⁸⁵ supplemented with various theological motifs such as non-reciprocal benefaction, discipleship, poverty and wealth, and so forth.⁸⁶ In regard to the bulk of interpretive endeavors that examine the textual fabric of Luke-Acts, Green criticizes them on the basis that they erroneously assume authors and their texts are wholly determined by their socio-historical contexts. On the contrary, he contends the narrative discourse exhibits both conformity and non-conformity with its socio-historical location.⁸⁷ Through an integrated hermeneutic that embraces an assortment of methodologies, Green pushes the investigation of Luke-Acts to new vistas. The weaknesses of his interpretive endeavor are twofold. The first revolves around the fact that discourse analysis has not gained widespread acceptance as a *modus operandi* in biblical studies. Green's adoption of the same three-fold methodological framework from discourse analysis – co-text, intertext, and context – could be expressed just as easily using the taxonomies of intratextuality, intertextuality, and extratextuality, literary constructs with more wide-spread acceptance both inside and outside the field of biblical studies. The second pertains to the absence of an in-depth examination of socio-historical readerly concerns focused on a multivalent authorial audience; Green almost exclusively looks at the potential meaning-making dimensions of the narrative discourse from the vantage of a one-dimensional construct (“model reader” as defined by Umberto Eco) rather than an audience encompassing different economic, religious, gender, and other cultural frameworks.

⁸⁵“‘Salvation to the End of the Earth’ (Acts 13:47): God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Witness to the Gospel*, 83-106.

⁸⁶*Theology of the Gospel*, *passim*.

⁸⁷See, e.g., “The Social Status of Mary in Luke 1,5-2,52: A Plea for Methodological Integration,” *Biblica* 73 (1992) 457-72.

Inquiries (and debate) into the generic conventions of Luke-Acts have spurred a spate of studies on generic parallels between Luke-Acts and Greco-Roman narrative, ranging from historiography, to novels, to epics, to biographies. Correspondence between the rhetorical arrangement, invention, and style of Luke-Acts and Greco-Roman narrative provides a framework for uncovering rhetorical strategies and ideological systems of author and reader. Perhaps the scholar who has pushed the discussion in this area the furthest is Loveday C.A. Alexander.⁸⁸ She argues that the prologues of Luke and Acts – which coincide most closely with scientific technical treatises situated on the periphery of historiography – play a crucial role in prompting the reader to place the text within a socio-historical setting that demarcates rhetorical strategies and ideological parameters for the initial readers. The focus and direction of the rhetorical argument of the narrative discourse also feed into her construction of the apologetic aims of the narrative as well as the ideological location of Theophilus and the earliest recipients of Luke-Acts. She subsequently concludes that Luke-Acts is directed towards the Diaspora Jewish community – perhaps the one in Rome – with the apologetic aim of persuading its various constituents to afford the Christian movement a fair hearing.⁸⁹

⁸⁸Starting with *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (Society of New Testament Supplement Monograph Series, 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) *passim*. Also, “Formal Elements and Genre: Which Greco-Roman Prologues Most Closely Parallel the Lukan Prologues?” in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity International Press, 1999) 9-26.

⁸⁹“The Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price in association with Christopher Rowland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 15-44.

A key part of Alexander's argument that identifies the Jewish community as the target audience of Luke-Acts revolves around the enigmatic ending of Acts (28.17-31). Alexander, along with several other scholars over the past decade, pinpoint the importance of the open-ended conclusion as a hermeneutical key to the narrative, a rhetorical device that prompts the reader to analeptically reevaluate the preceding discourse.⁹⁰ They also contend that enigmatic endings are a common literary device in Greco-Roman narrative, a rhetorical tool that prods the reader to complete the story in conjunction with the narrative discourse. In particular, there are a number of rhetorical threads in the closing scene that incite intratextual connections with earlier scenes and activities – ranging from linkages to Lk 3-4 (particularly 4.16-30), to the citation of Isa 6.9-10, to the theme of salvation. Alexander carries the argument a step further by suggesting that the closing scene serves as a “framing” device that guides the reader to reevaluate earlier narrative discourse and brings the narrative world closer to that of the reader.⁹¹ This recent investigation by Alexander into the retrospective activity that the ending of Acts induces will play an important role in my analysis in chapter nine that will highlight ways in which the narrative discourse – as established by the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry – brings about prospective and retrospective appropriation.

⁹⁰See, especially, Loveday C.A. Alexander, “Reading Luke-Acts From Back to Front,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheydon (*Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium*, 112; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999) 419-46. Also, cf. Marguerat, “End of Acts (28,16-31),” 74-89; idem, “Silent Closing,” 284-304; William F. Bosend, II, “The means of absent ends,” in *History, Literature and Society*, 348-62; Wasserberg, *Aus Israels*, 71-115, 352-54.

⁹¹“Reading Luke-Acts,” 419-46.

Despite general wide-spread acceptance, some uncertainty involving Alexander's separation of Luke-Acts from the genre of ancient historiography and designation of the scientific treatise as the generic tradition behind the two-volume work exists. First, similarities between Luke-Acts and the scientific treatise start and end with the prologues; apart from the prologues, Luke and Acts primarily consist of narrative discourse, whereas the scientific treatise traditions consist of expository and descriptive discourse.⁹² Second, *contra* earlier indications of vast discrepancies between the Lukan prologue (1.1-4) and those found in ancient historiography, several pinpoint closer correspondence than previously thought (viz., Plutarch,⁹³ Dionysius,⁹⁴ Jewish Hellenistic historians⁹⁵). Third, there is increasing recognition of the fluidity between different narrative genres in late antiquity, thus making it quite possible that Luke-Acts contains arrangement, invention, and style representative of two or more

⁹²See David E. Aune, "Luke 1.1-4: Historical or Scientific *Prooimion*?" in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J.M. Wedderburn*, ed. Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey, and Bruce Longenecker (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003) 138-48.

⁹³David L. Balch, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ: Jesus as Founder of the Church in Luke-Acts: Form and Function," in *Contextualizing Acts*, 142-49, drawing on the analysis of Timothy E. Duff (*Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1999] 14-20, 66), argues that the narratives of Plutarch resemble both the biographical and historiographical generic taxonomies. Also, cf. Balch's earlier essay, "Septem Sapientium Convivium (*Moralia* 146B-164D)," in *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*, ed. Hans Dieter Betz (Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti; Leiden: Brill Publishers, 1978) 51-105.

⁹⁴For parallels with Dionysius, see David L. Balch, "Comments on the Genre and a Political Theme of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two Hellenistic Historians," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 343-61; idem, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ," 139-88.

⁹⁵For parallels with Hellenistic Jewish historiography, see Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Novum Testamentum Supplement Series, 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

generic categories.⁹⁶ Finally, as argued by David E. Aune, the distinction between prologues in historiography and the scientific treatise tradition is quite possibly a false dichotomy.⁹⁷

3 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

Several areas become apparent from the preceding analysis. First and foremost is the lack of attention paid to the speeches found in the Lukan Galilean ministry. The lack of cohesive, comprehensive readings of plot and characterization has perhaps contributed to this area of neglect, with most investigation focusing on individual narrative units or specific character groups apart from the larger narrative. Second, the relevance of Greco-Roman rhetoric for understanding the rhetorical texture of and identifying the trajectories that extend from the four speeches of the Galilean ministry is not considered by most interpretive inquiries. In addition, in the case of the few who do give some time to understanding the rhetorical argument of the four speeches, they generally play down their pertinence via criticism of Luke's employment of "second-class" rhetoric. Third, investigation largely follows a formalistic line of inquiry, failing to evaluate the narrative discourse in terms of understanding better the potential ways in which it coheres or does not cohere with ideological systems. Finally, for the most part, those who propose ways in which the narrative discourse shapes new horizons for the earliest readers – or, for that matter, readers throughout history – assume a one-

⁹⁶Interestingly, Loveday C.A. Alexander ("Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts," *New Testament Studies* 44 [1998] 380-99) suggests Acts contains elements of both the ancient novel and ancient historiography.

⁹⁷"Luke 1.1-4," 145-47.

dimensional model that does not ask how ideological systems of different readers might impact the appropriation process.

2

A METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATION FOR INVESTIGATION: TOWARDS READING AS CONDUCTION¹

The field of biblical studies is strewn with varying methodological attempts to mine the biblical text for new insights and to uncover previously hidden meanings. The text of Luke-Acts has not gone untouched in this flurry of investigation, as initial queries into its literary nuances in the late 1980s quickly developed into a frenetic rush of inquiries using narrative, reader-response, rhetorical, and sociological criticisms in the 1990s. In the main, the bulk of investigation during the 1990s remained formalistic, concentrating on intratextual and intertextual elements contributing to the construction of plot, characterization, and point-of-view. This was supplemented by a separate, largely unrelated interest in extratextual features – cultural information on beliefs and actions related to hospitality, gender, honor and shame, home, sex, business, and more. In both instances, the result is an interpretive experience that predominantly does not probe beyond autonomous, intrinsic forms. My fault with these approaches lies in the fact that – while some very interesting insights have been pinpointed – they largely fail to discuss and subsequently evaluate the rhetorical impact these characteristics have on

¹“Conduction” is a mode of critical re-reading, an approach in which a reader probes the text for deeper meanings and for a better understanding of the principles or structures that determine the author’s act of composition. See below for further discussion.

the ideological location of what literary critics designate as the “authorial audience” (see below for more detail on this heuristic construct).²

I propose to move beyond this paradigm to a methodology that is more encompassing, one that not only considers how the implied reader identifies and constructs plot, characterization, theme, and motifs (*topoi*), but how the authorial audience enacts hermeneutical appropriation vis-à-vis ideological systems engendered by the narrative discourse. This hermeneutical mode necessitates an understanding that authors work within literary and social constraints resulting from their historical milieu yet also remain autonomous enough to challenge these same constraints.

Consequently, my proposed methodological approach not only asks about the conditions that shape a particular text but also ways in which these conditions did not shape it, instances where a text embodies ideological systems that alter or confront cultural assumptions of the status quo.³

1 A PHILOSOPHICAL FRAMEWORK

Actual flesh-and blood readers have a responsibility when reading texts to assume the “otherness” that the text places on them.⁴ Peter J. Rabinowitz explains that this requires “acceptance of the author’s invitation to read in a particular socially

²Initially proposed by Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Before Reading*, 15-42; idem, “Whirl without End,” 81-100; idem, “Truth in Fiction,” 121-41.

³Cf. Robert Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse: Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and European Socialism* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1989) 1-21.

⁴Note the comment of Wayne C. Booth, *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988) 136: “I serve myself best, as reader, when I both honor an author’s offering for what it is, in its full ‘otherness’ from me, and take an active critical stance against what seem to me its errors or excesses.”

constituted way that is shared by the author and his or her expected readers.”⁵

Consequently, any writer, wishing to be understood, must work within literary and social conventions, which a reader can identify by means of the historical and social knowledge of the culture from whence a text derives as well as extrapolate from the competencies required to fill certain reading roles that are ascribed by the implied author.⁶ My methodological investigation coincides with what Wayne C. Booth describes as “conduction” or “critical re-reading,” an approach in which a reader probes the text for deeper meanings and for a better understanding of the principles or structures that determine the author’s act of composition.⁷ With the objective of evaluating the authorial audience of Luke-Acts, specifically in terms of the rhetorical effects and narrative trajectories (e.g., theme, plot, characterization, *topoi*, etc.) engendered by the four speeches in the Galilean ministry, I will employ an eclectic methodological approach that draws upon narrative, rhetorical, reader-response, sociological, and ideological criticisms.⁸

⁵*Before Reading*, 22.

⁶Booth, *Company We Keep*, 152, explains “that no reading can be considered responsible that ignores the challenge of a work’s fixed norms.”

⁷Booth delineates three kinds of reading: (1) *reading with*: the reading we do when we simply accept what seems to us as the obvious demands of the text; (2) *reading against*: reading that sets out to find in the text whatever it does not promise or invite, whatever its author presumably never intended but unconsciously either allowed in or specifically banned; and (3) *critical reading*: the reading we do when we decide to go back and re-read, trying either to deepen or clarify the experience, or to discover how the author managed to achieve the results that we love (“The Ethics of Forms: Taking Flight with *The Wings of the Dove*,” in *Understanding Narrative*, ed. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz [Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1994] 102-05). Booth initially proffered reading as “conduction” in *Company We Keep*, *passim*, esp. 70-77.

⁸This methodological inquiry embodies many of the elements that comprise what is referred to as “socio-rhetorical criticism” (see Vernon K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* [London: Routledge, 1996]; idem, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* [Valley Forge,

I suggest that meaning focuses on what texts do to readers; it is not merely something awaiting to be recovered through the identification of rhetorical and narrative elements.⁹ Biblical texts do *not* have “meaning” in and of themselves, but instead offer potentialities of meaning that are actualized in the reading process, as readers react to texts in varying ways.¹⁰ Secular hermeneuts initiated the transformation to what is known as the postmodern at the beginning of the previous century when the philosophical effects of Immanuel Kant’s work began to be realized, especially in the literary, social-science, and historical disciplines. Prior to this, the

Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996]). In addition, there are close parallels between my methodological approach and what is designated as “discourse analysis,” which forms the basis of Green’s interpretative approach (e.g., *Gospel of Luke*, 11-20; “Discourse Analysis,” 175-96); also, Robert de Beaugrande, “Discourse Analysis,” in *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*, ed. Michael Groden and Martin Kreiswirth (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994) 207-10.

⁹Cf. Green, “The Practice of Reading the New Testament,” in *Hearing the New Testament*, 413:

... at this juncture we have moved far beyond the central concern of most hermeneutical reflection of this century. Hermeneutics has been occupied preeminently with how texts serve to pass on *information*. Biblical interpretation has emphasized ‘getting the meaning right’. According to this second understanding of the ‘practice of reading’, ... the focus shifts to the question of how texts might have a *transformative* role.

¹⁰I reject the postmodern predilection of some (e.g., Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism*, 108-78; George Aichele, et al., *The Postmodern Bible: The Bible and Culture Collective* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995] *passim*) to discard the “otherness” of the text for a solipsistic examination of the reader, though I do not dismiss the hermeneutical importance of examining “Other” reading positions. Cf. Michael LaFargue (“Are Texts Determinant? Derrida, Barth, and the Role of the Biblical Scholar,” *Harvard Theological Review* 81 [1988] 341-57): “The role of the biblical scholar, as scholar, is to be a servant to the biblical text, to guard its otherness, to help make its substantive content something modern people can in some way experience and understand, in its particularity and in its otherness” (355); also, Kevin J. Vanhoozer (“The Reader in New Testament Interpretation,” *Hearing the New Testament*, 317): “If meaning were not in some sense ‘there’ in the text, how could texts ever challenge, inform, or transform their readers? How could texts ever criticize a dominant ideology? ... where meaning is independent of the interpretive process, reading would cease to be a dangerous, world-shattering prospect. One would then have not to celebrate the birth of the reader but to mourn the stillborn reader.”

various disciplines were firmly rooted in the philosophical underpinnings of Cartesian thought, in which knowledge was defined in terms of a mind apprehending an object; the result was the belief that something precedes understanding. Kant claims, however, that the “knower” attributes something to the object of knowledge, and thus the mind does not simply mirror but instead constructs its object; accordingly, the mind does not correspond to the world but the world to the mind.¹¹ The eventual result of Kant’s shift from epistemology to ontology is the postmodern turn, where language is no longer considered as referential signs with semantic content but as signs for playing certain games or performing certain acts, concomitant upon the manner in which the subject uses them.

Those who operate on the basis of Cartesian thought adhere to the notion that something precedes reading; meaning is tethered to the concept of “authorial intention.”¹² Secular hermeneuts in the late 1920s recognized the impending breakdown in Cartesian epistemology (i.e., the impossibility of neutrality and/or objectivity), thereby shifting their focus from author to text. Perhaps the most notable example of this permutation is the essay, “The Intentional Fallacy,” in which the authors, William K. Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley, argue that reports of an author’s

¹¹See, e.g., Roger Lundin, *The Culture of Interpretation: Christian Faith and the Postmodern World* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), who envisions Kant as the initiator in the turn from modernism to postmodernism.

¹²The most notable adherent of this view in recent decades is E D. Hirsch, Jr., who argues that interpreters should relate to texts on two separate levels – that of “meaning,” which he ties to “authorial intention,” and that of “significance”, which results when the reader connects the “meaning” of a text to contemporary events. Hirsch, therefore, considers as valid only those interpretations that excavate the “authorial intention” of a text (*Validity in Interpretation* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967]; idem, *The Aims of Interpretation* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976]). Also, cf. Elliott E. Johnson, *Expository Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Academie, 1990).

original intention are not germane to judging a work of art; a text's meaning instead hinges upon what is actually expressed in its words.¹³ Notwithstanding, the consequences of the Copernican Revolution were incomplete without a complete break with the subject/object dichotomy. Hermeneuts in the 1960s and 1970s thus shifted their attention to the subject.¹⁴ All reading, in this respect, is envisioned as historically conditioned and theory-laden: the reader functions as the determining factor in interpretation by circumscribing which interpretive approach or approaches are to be employed.¹⁵ Accordingly, the reader becomes an integral part of the hermeneutical enterprise, as biblical texts can have different meanings in different social and historical locations.

2 THE PLAYGROUND: AUTHOR, TEXT, AND READER

Most acknowledge that the entities of author, text, and reader are closely interconnected in a relationship that, when enacted in the reading process, engenders meaning that did not exist before. Meaning, then, cannot arise without interaction between each of these elements. Wolfgang Iser aptly describes this interplay in terms of a “playground:”

¹³See William K. Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley, “The Intentional Fallacy,” in *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*, ed. W. K. Wimsatt (New York: Noonday Press, 1966) 193-225.

¹⁴E.g., see Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), who maintains the context of the subject in a particular community influences the kinds of questions that will be asked.

¹⁵Robert Morgan with John Barton (*Biblical Interpretation* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988]) explain “the study of texts is always undertaken within some larger framework, whether this is recognized or not. The larger framework, constituted by interpreters’ interests, determines what questions are considered important, what methods are found appropriate, and what explanations are deemed satisfying.” (22)

Authors play games with readers, and the text is the playground. The text itself is the outcome of an intentional act whereby the author refers to and intervenes in an existing world, but though the act is intentional, it aims at something that is not yet accessible to consciousness. Thus the text is made up of a world that is yet to be identified and is adumbrated in such a way as to invite picturing and eventual interpretation by the reader. This double operation of imagining and interpreting engages the reader in the task of visualizing the many possible shapes of the identifiable world, so that inevitably the world repeated in the text begins to undergo changes ... it automatically invokes a convention-governed contract between author and reader indicating that the textual world is to be viewed not as reality but as if it *were* reality.¹⁶

The reader in this paradigm is an essential entity, spawning meaning by engaging the reality represented within the world of the text by means of construing and interacting with it in varying manners and building consistency in her or his configuration of the text. When this occurs, the reader steps out of her or his life-world into the various possibilities represented in the “alterity” (or “otherness”) of the biblical text.¹⁷

2.1 Encountering and Appropriating the Otherness

The reciprocal interaction between author, text, and reader requires a framework of understanding that envisions the act of engagement as both constructive

¹⁶Wolfgang Iser, *Prospecting: From Reader-Response to Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1989), 250. (his *italics*)

¹⁷This process is aptly described by Wolfgang Iser, *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1993) 1-21; idem, “The Play of the Text,” in *Languages of the Unsayable: The Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*, ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996) 325-39. Note his description of meaning as “primarily the semantic operation that takes place between the given text, as a fictional gestalt of the imaginary, and the reader; hence it is pragmatization of the imaginary. The fictive, in turn, brings about transformation of the realities incorporated in the text by overstepping them; hence it is a medium for the imaginary. While the imaginary attains its concreteness and its effectiveness by way of the fictive, its appearance is inevitably conditioned by language.” (*Fictive and the Imaginary*, 20)

and receptive. Readers approach biblical texts from situated reading positions with specific interpretive conventions that determine the perspectives from which a text is examined. As a result, readers project hypotheses that reflect their presuppositions, past experiences, and the conventions they have learned in order to understand the world denoted in the text. The result is a multidimensional hermeneutical experience, as “different readers, because of their specific interests, concerns, and backgrounds, perceive different yet coherent meanings in a text by selecting one of the assorted meaning-producing dimensions.”¹⁸ In the case of Luke-Acts, as discussed in chapter one, a preponderance of scholarly investigation, even in regard to literary, rhetorical, and sociological inquiries, maintains the subject/object dichotomy and approaches the narrative text as a repository waiting to be unlocked. Under this methodological framework, plot and characterization, rhetorical texture, and sociological issues are inherent textual structures versus frameworks that are constructed by readers – ranging from real flesh-and-blood readers of today to authorial readers of antiquity.

The transformative effects of the reading experience, however, cannot take place without a fusion of the horizons of text and reader. This occurs, as Hans-Georg Gadamer explains, when readers encounter negative instances – confrontations with

¹⁸Daniel Patte, *Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: A Reevaluation* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995) 28. Patte draws upon the work of Mieke Bal (*Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* [Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1985]; idem, *On Meaning-Making: Essays in Semiotics* [Foundations & Facets; Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1994]), arguing that critical investigations of texts involve the selection of different “codes” as foci, such as the historical, theological, anthropological, literary, etc. Cf. the remarks of Paul B. Armstrong, *Conflicting Readings: Variety and Validity in Interpretation* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina Press, 1990): “a text is not an independent object which remains the same regardless of how it is construed. The literary work is not autonomous but ‘heteronomous’ – paradoxically both dependent and independent, capable of taking on different shapes according to opposing hypotheses about how to configure it, but always transcending any particular interpreter’s beliefs about it.” (x)

something not already assimilated in the life world of the reader;¹⁹ the horizon of the reader is expanded and transformed, as her or his life-world is confirmed, disoriented, or confronted by the horizon represented in the text.²⁰ Paul Ricoeur describes this hermeneutical process as appropriation, namely, new practices of being generated in the experience of reading texts that result in the broadening of the subject's capacity for self-understanding.²¹ Now, what is interesting about this process, is that the both the authorial audience and the "real flesh-and-blood reader" construct meaning from texts, whether heard or read. Real flesh-and-blood readers can move beyond the methodological framework of what Booth describes as "reading with," whereby the reader (or "listener" in the case of the authorial audience of Luke-Acts) simply accepts what seems to be the obvious demands of the narrative discourse. Employing what Booth posits as reading as conduction, real flesh-and-blood readers can critically evaluate the actual reading process, opting to go back and re-read in an attempt either to deepen or clarify the experience by discovering how the implied author managed to

¹⁹Cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2d ed. (New York: Continuum, 1992) esp. 346-62: "... a hermeneutically trained consciousness must be, from the start, sensitive to the text's alterity. But this kind of sensitivity involves neither 'neutrality' with respect to content nor the extinction of one's self, but the foregrounding and appropriation of one's fore-meanings and prejudices. The important thing is to be aware of one's own bias, so that the text can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one's own fore-meanings." (269)

²⁰Paul Ricoeur (*Time and Narrative*, vol. 2, trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984] 143-69) contends that meaning occurs "... when the world of the text is confronted with the world of the reader. Only then does the literary work acquire a meaning in the full sense of the term, at the intersection of the world projected by the text and the life-world of the reader." (160) Also, Wolfgang Iser, "The Interplay Between Creation and Interpretation," *New Literary History* 15 (1984) 387-96.

²¹Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976), *passim*.

achieve the results.²² In addition to weighing the various textual elements such as theme, plot, characterization, and *topoi*, readers evaluate the relationship between the narrative discourse and the ideological location of the authorial audience, as to whether the narrative discourse confirms, amplifies, or modifies cultural systems.²³ Interpretive approaches to Luke-Acts largely omit this latter hermeneutical step, remaining essentially formalistic in their methodological inquiries by failing to consider how the authorial audience constructs meaning via the ideological systems engendered from the narrative discourse.²⁴ In the case of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry, scholarly investigation focuses largely around attempts to peel back redactional layers in order to identify earlier strata (and thus reconstruct the theological and sociological systems of the earliest followers of Jesus)²⁵ or ways in which the speeches demarcate narrative trajectories.²⁶

The implications of a reader's encounter with the otherness of the text does not occur always at a given moment in time, but rather frequently transpires over an extended duration, for, as Booth explains:

²²See Booth, "Taking Flight," 102-05; idem, *Company We Keep*, *passim*, esp. 70-77.

²³For a description of the process in which real flesh-and-blood readers engage the authorial audience, see Michael W. Smith and Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Authorizing Readers: Resistance and Respect in the Teaching of Literature* (New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1997) *passim*, esp. 48-87.

²⁴However cf., e.g., David B. Gowler, "Text, Culture, and Ideology in Luke 7:1-10: A Dialogic Reading," in *Fabrics of Discourse: Culture, Ideology, and Religion*, ed. David B. Gowler, L. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane F. Watson (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2003) 89-125.

²⁵Examples are numerous; see, e.g., Leif E. Vaage, "Composite Texts and Oral Mythology: The Case of the 'Sermon' in Q (6:20-49)," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995) 75-97.

²⁶See, e.g., Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1, 60-74.

... 'real life' is lived in images derived in part from stories. ... our imitations of *narrative* 'imitations of life' are so spontaneous and plentiful that we cannot draw a clear line between what we *are* ... and what we have become as we have first enjoyed, then imitated, and then, perhaps, criticized both the stories and our responses to them.²⁷

Regardless, the hermeneutical process of engaging the otherness of the biblical world does not accept uncritically whatever is appealing, scampering from one biblical text to the next without pause for reflection; on the contrary, though readers surrender to the otherness of the biblical text as fully as possible on every occasion, readers also supplement, correct, and refine their experience vis-à-vis ethical and ideological criticism of both the biblical text and their reading locations and interpretive strategies.²⁸ For Luke-Acts, the hermeneutical mode of critical re-reading has been predominantly confined to the issues of gender and ethnicity,²⁹ with scholars posing questions concerning the extent to which the narrative discourse prompts readers to embrace ideological systems deemed as androcentric³⁰ or anti-Semitic.³¹

²⁷Booth, *Company We Keep*, 229. (his *italics*)

²⁸*Ibid.*, 280-90.

²⁹There are signs of "critical re-reading" movement beyond ethnicity and gender – see, e.g., Todd Penner, "Civilizing Discourse: Acts, Declamation, and the Rhetoric of the *Polis*," in *Contextualizing Acts*, 65-104.

³⁰See, e.g., Mary Rose D'Angelo, "The ANHP Question in Luke-Acts: Imperial Masculinity and the Deployment of Women in the Early Second Century," in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff (London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 44-69.

³¹See, e.g., Joseph B. Tyson, *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).

2.2 Interpretation and Overinterpretation

I readily acknowledge that texts are inert until activated by readers; interpretations deviate according to different interactions between the world of the text and the world of the reader. The openness of the hermeneutical enterprise, however, does not necessitate that texts, as some would lead us to believe,³² assume the character of a “wishing well,” from which readers draw what they like.³³ According to Umberto Eco, both texts and readers have rights. Hermeneutical endeavors that do not respect the rights of both are inadequate and moreover, when they afford primacy to one over the other, run the risk of victimizing the rights of the other.³⁴ I, therefore, make a distinction between “using” and “interpreting” texts: those who “use” texts ask neither author nor text about their intentions, but “beat” texts into shapes that will suit their purposes, while those who “interpret” texts read them in order to discover something about their nature.³⁵ Eco explains,

... to say that interpretation is potentially unlimited does not mean that interpretation has no object and that it “riverruns” for the mere sake of itself. To say that a text potentially has no end does not mean that *every* act of interpretation can have a happy ending. Even the most radical deconstructionists accept the idea that there are interpretations which are blatantly unacceptable. This means that the interpreted text imposes

³²For example, see Jeffrey Stout (“What Is the Meaning of a Text?” *New Literary History* 14 [1982] 1-12) and Stephen Fowl (“Texts Don’t Have Idologies,” *Biblical Interpretation* 3 [1995] 15-34).

³³The figure of a “wishing well” is found in Vanhoozer, “New Testament Interpretation,” 316.

³⁴Umberto Eco, “Interpretation and history,” in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 23-44.

³⁵Cf. Umberto Eco, *The Limits of Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990) 57: “To critically interpret a text means to read it in order to discover, along with our reactions to it, something about its nature. To use a text means to start from it in order to get something else, even accepting the risk of misinterpreting it from the semantic point of view.”

some constraints upon its interpreters. The limits of interpretation coincide with the rights of the text (which does not mean with the rights of its author).³⁶

We can subsequently construe the rights of the text in terms of “textual intent,” which serves as a conduit for meaning,³⁷ providing the reader with an intratextual and extratextual protocol that can be approached from multiple dimensions.³⁸ Hence, for example, the prologues to Luke (1.1-4) and Acts (1.1-2) are framing devices that establish interpretive parameters for the implied reader.³⁹ Likewise, the implied author assumes a knowledge of the LXX on the part of the implied reader, with the intersection of LXX citations and allusions providing the basis for the construction of

³⁶Eco, *Limits*, 6-7. (his *italics*)

³⁷For a discussion of “textual intent,” see Seymour Chatman (*Coming To Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* [Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989] 74-89) and Monroe Beardsley (“Intentions and Interpretations: A Fallacy Revisited,” in *The Aesthetic Point of View*, ed. Michael Wreen and Donald Callen [Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986] 188-207). In particular, note the comments of Eco:

... every text is a complex inferential mechanism which has to be actualized in its implicit content by the reader ... who has to “fill” the text with a number of textual inferences, connected to a large set of presuppositions defined by a given context. It is possible to hypothesize that for every text there is a system which organizes the possible inferences of that text, and this system can be represented in an encyclopedic format. The text constructs a particular semantic description representing the textually possible world, with its own individuals and properties. (*Limits of Interpretation*, 260)

³⁸W. John Harker (“Information Processing and the Reading of Literary Texts,” *New Literary History* 20 [1989] 471) explains that “... constraints on meaning emanating from both the text and the reader’s conceptual knowledge interact to produce a construction of meaning deriving from both information sources.”

³⁹See, e.g., David P. Moessner, “The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1.1-4): Luke’s Superior Credentials (παρηκολουθηκότι), Narrative Sequence (καθεξῆς), and Firmness of Understanding (ἀσφάλεια) for the Reader,” in *Interpreter of Israel*, 84-123; idem, “The Lukan Prologues in the Light of Ancient Narrative Hermeneutics: Παρηκολουθηκότι and the Credentialed Author,” in *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 399-417; Loveday C.A. Alexander, “The Preface to Acts and the historians,” in *History, Literature and Society*, 73-103; eadem, “Formal Elements and Genre,” 9-26; eadem, *Preface*, *passim*.

meaning.⁴⁰ In the case of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry – as with other narrative from Greco-Roman antiquity, a presupposition pool – the implied reader approaches them with the understanding that their rhetorical texture serves to demarcate interpretive frameworks for overarching narrative, both analeptically and proleptically.⁴¹

3 CONSTRUCTING MEANING: COMBINATION, SELECTION, AND THE IMAGINARY

Appropriation of texts occurs in what many describe as the realm of the imaginary, that is, the subject's conceptualization (or ideation) of the object. Iser observes that "the imaginary is not a self-activating potential," but instead must be brought into play from outside itself, propagated by the to-and-fro movement between the realms of text and reader.⁴² Such occurs in three interacting functions, which Iser delineates as combination, selection, and the "as-if" construction (i.e., the set of attitudes represented in the world of the text).⁴³ Each of these heuristic functions evince an assortment of interpretive strategies from which to examine the multidimensional meaning potentialities of a text.

⁴⁰See, e.g., Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

⁴¹See chapter three for further discussion.

⁴²Iser, *Fictive and the Imaginary*, 222-23. Also, cf. Paul Ricoeur, *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics, II*, trans. Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1991) 168-187.

⁴³For a discussion, see Iser, *Fictive and the Imaginary*, 2-21, 222-38.

3.1 Reading Dynamics, the Implied Reader, and Authorial Readers

Every text contains a selection from a variety of social, historical, cultural, gender, religious, economic, and literary systems that exist as referential fields (or presupposition pools) outside the text.⁴⁴ According to Rabinowitz, these “ . . . are not in the text waiting to be uncovered, but in fact *precede* the text and make discovery possible in the first place.”⁴⁵ Hence, in order for readers to engage certain meaning-producing dimensions of a text, they must decode portions of the referential fields that are presupposed by the text.⁴⁶ Since the act of selection involves inclusion and exclusion on the part of authors, readers view the present through what is absent, and the absent through what is present; in doing so, readers are able to construct meaning from the text, bringing it life. The hypothetical audience, capable of recognizing rhetorical conventions, intertextual referents, and extratextual connotations, embodies the heuristic construct of what Rabinowitz calls the “authorial audience” – a designation that has gained widespread acceptance in the past decade, including the field of biblical studies.⁴⁷ In addition, though the term “reader” is used in the analysis

⁴⁴Cf. Rabinowitz (*Before Reading*, 19): “an author cannot begin to fill up a blank page without making assumptions about the readers’ beliefs, knowledge, and familiarity with conventions.”

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 27.

⁴⁶Rabinowitz (*Before Reading*, 29-36) points out that readers must possess some knowledge of the extratext in order to move beyond that reading (he describes this as “authorial reading”) to look at the work critically from some perspective other than the one called for by the author. He thus concludes that “ . . . while authorial reading without further critique is often incomplete, so is a critical reading without an understanding of the authorial audience at its base.” (32) Also, cf. Robert Scholes (*Protocols of Reading* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989] 1-88).

⁴⁷*Before Reading*, 15-42; idem, “Whirl without End,” 81-100; idem, “Truth in Fiction,” 121-41.

on occasion in regard to the authorial audience, it is more accurate to speak of the audiences' of the Gospels and Acts in terms of listeners rather than readers because of the low literacy levels in antiquity, coupled with the fact that reading was conducted as a presentation (a means of entertainment) before an audience.⁴⁸

An underlying premise of my analysis is that the authorial audience is a somewhat elusive heuristic construct. In order to ascertain the precise hermeneutical effects of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts, a social, religious, ethnic, and gender orientation must be assumed on the part of the authorial audience. The resulting location partially determines hermeneutical appropriation of the narrative discourse. In this context, ideology designates the systems of representation – ideas, beliefs, and feelings – through which authorial readers of different cultural backgrounds order reality.⁴⁹ Because any authorial audience consists of disparate cultural systems, my contention is that we must speak of the narrative discourse as producing multidimensional ideological effects.⁵⁰ Consequently, though somewhat intertwined, a difference exists between the implied reader and the authorial audience. Whereas the implied reader is a text-based function, the authorial audience is an extratextual entity

⁴⁸For more on the oral/aural nature of first-century CE Greco-Roman society, see Paul J. Achtemeier, "*Omne verbum sonat*," 3-27.

⁴⁹See, e.g., James H. Kavanagh, "Ideology," in *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, 2d, ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995) 306-20.

⁵⁰See Robert C. Tannehill, "'Cornelius' and 'Tabitha' Encounter Luke's Jesus," *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 347-56, for an initial attempt to read Luke-Acts from differing ideological locations. Also, cf. Ingrid Rosa Kitzberger, "Mary of Bethany and Mary of Magdala – Two Female Characters in the Johannine Passion Narrative: A Feminist, Narrative-Critical, Reader-Response," *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 564-86, who approaches the narrative discourse of the Gospel of John – vis-à-vis the characterization of Mary of Bethany and Mary of Magdala – from the heuristic construct of a female authorial reader.

consisting of various, multidimensional readers. My analysis of rhetorical texture in chapters four through seven and then narrative trajectories in chapter nine – as largely embedded within narrative and readerly concerns – will employ the implied reader as the listenerly/readerly construct standing in parallel with the implied author.⁵¹ The investigative approach of chapter nine, however, which will aim to understand better the ideological impact of the rhetorical texture and narrative trajectories, will turn its focus to the authorial audience (or more accurately different readers comprising the authorial audience).⁵²

3.1.1 *Theophilus: Literary Patronage*

Unfortunately, it is not possible to adumbrate the precise contours of the authorial audience of Luke-Acts due to the historical distance in time and equivocal nature of the narrative regarding the identity of the recipients. The identity of Theophilus has elicited a spate of discussion over the years. Some scholars find a possible symbolic description of the authorial audience in the etymological meaning of Theophilus as “dear to God” or “lover of God,” with the audience consisting of any who would align themselves with the message found within Luke-Acts.⁵³ Several

⁵¹In actuality, for the purposes of interpreting ancient Greco-Roman texts, including the New Testament documents, it would be more accurate to speak in terms of “implied listener” versus “implied reader.” However, since implied reader is used widely in literary criticism and biblical studies, and not wanting to introduce new terminology that could potentially confuse readers of this study, I will employ implied reader throughout my investigation.

⁵²I take this approach in “Narrative Echoes in John 21: Intertextual Interpretation and Intratextual Connection,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 75 (1999) 49-68, esp 64-67.

⁵³See, e.g., John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20* (Word Biblical Commentary Series, 35a; Dallas: Word Books, 1989) xxxii-xxxiii, 10, who concludes: “A symbolic significance for the name cannot be entirely ruled out. Much about Luke-Acts would well suit Cornelius-like

issues, however, mitigate against considering Theophilus as merely symbolic: (1) Theophilus is a common name, extant in various papyri and inscriptions; (2) the appellation “most excellent” is usually employed in reference to Roman political officials, individuals with advanced power and prestige; and (3) there are not extant symbolic dedications in other Greco-Roman literary works from antiquity.

Having concluded the above, however, we should not assume that Theophilus represents the Lukan community or that Theophilus is the only desired audience.⁵⁴ In regard to the former, there is growing consensus that the Gospels were not addressed simply to one group of individuals. In addition, endeavors to uncover the world behind the text are extremely reductionist in nature, running the risk of a “superficial kind of sociological allegorization.”⁵⁵ For the latter, while Theophilus is certainly recognized as the literary patron by the writer, it is not an attempt on the part of the writer to secure monetary support for multiplication or distribution or even to acknowledge monetary remuneration during the writing of Luke and then Acts. Unlike standard forms of patronage in Greco-Roman society, literary patronage was not reciprocal, that is, requiring that the writer become a client indebted to the benefactor.⁵⁶ Rather, the

readers.” (10)

⁵⁴Cf. the argument of Robert R. Creech, “The Most Excellent Narratee: The Significance of Theophilus in Luke-Acts,” in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr.*, ed. Raymond H. Keathley (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1990) 107-26, as well as that of Witherington, *Acts*, 63-65. Perhaps the most thorough-going attempt to identify the audience of Luke-Acts with one community is that of Esler, *Community and Gospel*, *passim*, esp. 30-45.

⁵⁵Note the comments of Stephen C. Barton, “Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?” in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997) 173-94 (quote: 179).

⁵⁶See Barbara K. Gold, *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987) *passim*.

literary patron – as in the case of Luke-Acts, namely, Theophilus – served as the conduit for circulation; the release of each volume to Theophilus allowed for its entree to a wider audience. Loveday C.A. Alexander explains:

This system – with all of its developments and ramifications – had the potential to offer an author an entree into a different social network of the patron’s own peers, whether by oral performance within the patron’s house, or by the disposition of a presentation copy of a book in the patron’s private library. Once there, a book would implicitly be available to any of the patron’s friends who wished to read or copy it.⁵⁷

The social networks of Theophilus, as a result, likely formed the avenues through which Luke-Acts circulated.⁵⁸ Though several scholars recently question the classification,⁵⁹ many believe that the nature of the prologues in Lk 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1-2, coupled with the style of the larger narrative, suggests a base of recipients belonging to the social matrix between upper literary classes and lower social levels, most likely

⁵⁷“Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels,” in *Gospels for All*, 98.

⁵⁸Alexander comments:

Where the patron is somehow seen as facilitating the “publication” of the book, this should be associated ... with the ancient conventions whereby the aristocracy were expected to provide a “hearth” for the public performance ... , as well as a meeting place for wandering scholars and teachers. ... the patron could provide another, equally valuable kind of hospitality for an author’s work in his library, where the text could be “deposited” for consultation and copying by his friends. Such a role could well make sense for Theophilus, whom we could see as an equivalent to the patrons of house churches known from the Pauline letters: his library, in this case, could well have become the basis of the church’s library. (“Book Production,” 103-04)

⁵⁹See, e.g., Penner, “Civilizing Discourse,” who notes that “ ... while the content and style of a book such as Acts may still be distinct on certain levels when compared to Tacitus, Livy, or Dionysius of Halicarnassus, on many fronts it is now perceived as fully consonant with the so-called high culture of antiquity.” (67)

free artisans and small business men and women.⁶⁰ In my opinion, attempts to identify a specific audience – in terms of geography, ethnicity, gender, religious beliefs, and more – are misdirected, chasing after a mirage that will remain forever evasive. Further, considering the oral/aural nature of communications in Greco-Roman antiquity, the multiple contexts in which texts were read, and the diverse ways in which early Christians gathered, it would be groundless to propose a precise setting in which Luke and Acts were heard.⁶¹

3.1.2 *Extratextual and Intertextual Repertoire*

Despite the above caveats, we can say some things about certain expectations the implied author imposes on the authorial audience. John A. Darr lists the following as constitutive elements of the extratext: (1) language; (2) social norms and cultural scripts; (3) classical or canonical literature; (4) literary conventions such as genres, type scenes, standard plots, rhetorical devices, and prototypes of characterization; (5) reading rules as how to categorize, rank, and process various kinds of textual data; and (6) commonly known historical and geographical facts.⁶² These referential fields essentially divide into two schemas: extratextual and intertextual. Extratextual

⁶⁰Those of more “high-browed” literary traditions looked upon technical and professional writing of those who worked with their hands with contempt, thus seemingly eliminating the upper literary class from purview (see, e.g., Alexander, *Preface*, 200-05). This corresponds with recent assessments that early Christianity was composed of a large number of free artisans and small business owners (see, e.g., Carolyn Osick and David L. Balch, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1997] 91-102).

⁶¹See F. Gerald Downing, “Theophilus’s First Reading of Luke-Acts,” in *Luke’s Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 91-109.

⁶²*Character Building*, 22; idem, *Herod the Fox*, 34-36.

repertoire concerns the presupposition of the implied author that the authorial audience possesses a knowledge of political, social, and religious beliefs and assumptions. Interaction of elements in this complex web of presuppositions engenders certain meanings on the part of the authorial audience. As to the four Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus, the implied author assumes extratextual knowledge of material benefaction, honor/shame protocols, agriculture, common rhymes, and more. Intertextual repertoire involves the referential interpretation of a previous text, in which one discourse becomes “the theme viewed from the standpoint of the other, and vice versa. This iterative movement enables old meanings to become material for new; it opens up long-established borders, and allows excluded meanings to enter and challenge the meanings that had excluded them.”⁶³ Regarding the narrative discourse of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry, significant knowledge of the LXX is presupposed by the implied author.

3.1.3 Authorial Readers and Ideological Location

Though caution must certainly be shown in doing so, it is possible to adumbrate the basic contours of the authorial audience of Luke-Acts. To begin, the authorial audience would fall within the social network of Theophilus, thus canvassing a broad spectrum of personages across society that would have included men and women, masters and slaves, patrons and clients, Gentile and Jew, powerful and weak, Roman citizens and non-citizens, and so on. Exclusion of any of the above from the ideological location of the authorial audience would be reductionistic, narrowing the possibilities for evaluation beyond the boundaries of what can be validated vis-à-vis

⁶³Iser, *Fictive and the Imaginary*, 227.

that which is found in the text of Luke-Acts. Second, we can likely speak of an authorial audience located in a Hellenistic urban setting.⁶⁴ Corroborating this claim is the widely held view that first-century and early second-century CE Christianity was largely an urban-based movement, coupled with descriptions within the narrative of Luke-Acts of housing, culture, and landscape indicative of a Hellenistic urban environment.⁶⁵ Third, considering the widespread understanding that the Lukan prologue (1.1-4) and the recapitulation of Acts (1.1-2) contain language typical of narrative popular among artisans and small business owners,⁶⁶ plus the wide-spread understanding of the early Christian movement as being most prevalent among the labor classes (i.e., those who work with their hands),⁶⁷ I propose a social location for the authorial audience that excluded the upper and lower classes.⁶⁸ Finally, while I

⁶⁴See the argument of Halvor Moxnes, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 379-89. However cf. Jim Grimshaw, "Luke's Market Exchange District: Decentering Luke's Rich Urban Center," *Semeia* 86 (1999) 33-51.

⁶⁵See, e.g., Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991) 125-49.

⁶⁶Alexander reaches this conclusion on the basis that the prologues of Luke and Acts correspond with those found in technical and scientific treatises (*Preface*, 29-36; idem, "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing," *Novum Testamentum* 28 [1986] 60-61). However, cf. Aune, "Luke 1.1-4," 138-48, who argues that Alexander draws a false dichotomy between the prologues found within the historical and scientific traditions. Regardless of the generic argument, scholarship, almost unanimously, acknowledges that the style of the language and composition of Luke-Acts does not coincide with narrative written for the upper class.

⁶⁷See Osiek and Balch, *Households and House Churches*, 91-102, for an overview. Also, Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983) 29-59, and Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983) 51-79.

⁶⁸The narrative discourse of Luke-Acts (e.g., Lk 12.16-21; 16.19-31) remonstrates against the elite rich, portraying them as outsiders, eliciting a negative judgment against such societal groups by the authorial audience (see Moxnes, *Economy*, 163-65). Also, Gerd Theissen, *Social Reality and the First Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New*

acknowledge the possibility that the authorial audience was partially comprised of “Godfearers” – devout Gentiles attracted to the tenets and practices of Jewish religious life – I reject the recent predilection of some scholars to tether the identity of the authorial audience to such an exact ethnic and religious entity.⁶⁹ The function of the literary patron as a social network for circulation and distribution purposes would inveigh against such in that Luke-Acts was not written for a monolithic community but rather a network of communities consisting of various ideological systems.

Ensuing from the above and supplemented with information from the narrative itself, several other facets comprising the extratextual repertoire of the authorial audience can be identified: (1) knowledge of Greek and Roman coinage; (2) knowledge of Greco-Roman religious beliefs and practices; (3) understanding of the larger Greco-Roman political and historical landscape, including key political and historical figures and events; (4) familiarity with eastern Mediterranean geography, including the boundaries of Roman provinces and basic configuration of major cities such as Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, and Jerusalem;⁷⁰ (5) awareness of social codes of patronage;⁷¹ (6) knowledge of social interaction during meal settings;⁷² (7)

Testament (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992) 270-71, who argues that the early Christian movement drew its members not from the “ruling elite,” but from the “fringe elite.”

⁶⁹*Contra* Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 35-39; idem, “Reading as a Godfearer,” 19-38; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 15-36.

⁷⁰The most complete discussion of geographical perspectives in relation to the narrative of Luke-Acts is in J. M. Scott, “Luke’s Geographical Horizon,” in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Volume Two: Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. D.W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994) 483-544.

⁷¹For a thorough description of patron-client relationships in Luke-Acts, see Halvor Moxnes, “Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts,” in *Social World*,

understanding of social codes denoting appropriate and inappropriate behavior, including that of male-female interaction in public venues;⁷³ (8) knowledge of ancient rhetoric and oratory practices; (9) familiarity with names, stories, characters, and wording from the LXX; and (10) knowledge of Hellenistic texts and the traditions that ensued from them.⁷⁴

3.2 Processing Texts: Consistency and Coherency

Readers process texts by drawing on various schematic conventions, which interact to corroborate or limit one another as meaning is engendered by the reader.⁷⁵ This is accomplished by means of “bottom-up” processing and “top-down” processing.⁷⁶ Bottom-up processing takes place by induction, moving from the parts to the whole, encompassing elements such as lexicon, syntax, and texture. These elements begin with the connotations of the actual words contained in the text and move to

241-70.

⁷²For an overview of meal settings in Luke-Acts and the various social connotations surrounding them, see Jerome H. Neyrey, “Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table-Fellowship,” in *Social World*, 361-88. Also, cf. Dennis E. Smith, “Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987) 613-38.

⁷³See Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, “Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values in the Mediterranean World,” in *Social World*, 25-65.

⁷⁴The following adumbrate various facets belonging to the social and ideological location of the authorial audience: Robbins, “Implied Author of Luke-Acts,” 305-32; Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 19-42; idem, “Reading as a Godfearer,” 19-38; Moxnes, “Social Context,” 379-89.

⁷⁵Rabinowitz (*Before Reading*, *passim*, esp. 15-46) delineates four categories that guide readers in the construction of meaning: (1) rules of notice; (2) signification; (3) configuration; and (4) coherence.

⁷⁶See Jerry Camery-Hoggatt (*Speaking of God: Reading and Preaching the Word of God* [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995] 91-113) and Green (“Practice of Reading,” 420-21) for a discussion of “bottom-up” and “top-down” reading strategies.

aspects such as delineation of textual units and interconnection of textual units. Top-down processing, in contrast, is deductive, moving from the whole to the parts, encompassing elements such as theme, motifs, plot, characterization, genre, intertextual connotations, and extratextual referents. These two modes of processing texts correspond with the description of rhetorical argument as inductive and deductive in the rhetorical handbooks of Greco-Roman antiquity.⁷⁷

3.2.1 *Rhetorical Argument*

A profound interest in Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks is shown towards the use of rhetorical devices, with the intent of persuading and moving the audience to make certain judgments. Since the fundamental characteristic of discourse in antiquity was oral, for the ear more than for the eye, many of the devices delineated pertain to auditory reception.⁷⁸ For example, Demetrius' *On Style* begins by addressing basic grammatical issues of word choice, structure of sentences, use of clauses, and development of periods (combination of clauses and phrases) and then moves to more encompassing denotations such as style. Perhaps the most often-used rhetorical category is repetition, whether in the context of smaller units or the text as a whole.⁷⁹

⁷⁷Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.2.7-1.2.22.

⁷⁸The majority of classical scholars hold the view that reading in Greco-Roman antiquity was done aloud and very rarely in silence (e.g., Rosalind Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992] *passim*; Achtemeier, "Omne verbum sonat," 3-27). However cf. A.K. Gavrilov, "Reading Techniques in Classical Antiquity," *Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997) 56-73, who contends that silent reading was a common practice in classical Athens and thus – *contra* to much of scholarly opinion – reading in antiquity was not much unlike that of modernity – with texts read aloud as well as silently. Also, Frank D. Gilliard, "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non omne verbum sonat*," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993) 689-96.

⁷⁹Repetition includes elements such as *pleonasm* (redundancy), *homoioteleuton* (similar end sounds), *onomatopoeia* (words that express similar sounds), *parachesis* (repetition of the same sound in consecutive words), *chiasmus* (crosswise repetition), and *anaphora*

The ultimate aim of reading (and listening) is to build consistency in a text by fitting everything into a consistent pattern.⁸⁰ Because readers process texts in a linear fashion, the reading experience is both sequential and holistic: the reader supplies missing information and clarifies ambiguities both sequentially and retrospectively vis-à-vis the extratextual repertoire, intertextual connections, and intratextual information.⁸¹

Repetition – and the importance of building consistency – will play an important role in my rhetorical analysis of the four speeches of Jesus from the Galilean ministry in chapters four through seven and then in the subsequent adumbration of their narrative trajectories in chapter nine.

3.2.2 *Intertextual Echoes and Weaving*

Though other modes of intertextuality can be discussed in relation to the hermeneutical process – such as reading Luke against Mark or reading the beheading of John the Baptist in parallel with artistic characterizations⁸² – I suggest that all texts are built from and assume other texts. The intertextual web – direct and indirect, intentional and unintentional – consists of stock forms, recognizable story patterns, and various uses of language. Every text is thus an intertextual field of transpositions from

(repetition of the same word at the beginning of clauses).

⁸⁰See, e.g., Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1451a-1451b; Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 11.1-12.1; Lucian, *How to Write History*, 55.

⁸¹For a description of how readers build consistency by means of supplying missing information and/or disambiguation, see Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetics* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1978) *passim*, especially 163-74.

⁸²See, e.g., Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) 237-60, who reads Matthew against Mark.

various signifying systems, an absorption and transformation of the precursor.⁸³ The resulting intersection of texts assists the implied reader in the construction of elements such as plot and characterization while simultaneously prompting the authorial audience to create new ideological horizons.⁸⁴ The narrative of Luke-Acts is replete with an interplay of other texts, networked systems of references forming the intertextual repertoire of the implied reader, serving as invitations to the implied reader to hear the current narrative vis-à-vis reverberations and continuations of previous texts.⁸⁵

In regard to intertextual repertoire, I suggest a broad range of Jewish and Hellenistic texts as the basis. The most obvious intertext is the LXX, with particular familiarity with the second book of Isaiah, as the narrative discourse is replete with quotations, direct references, and indirect allusions to it. Notwithstanding, while the LXX is by far the most predominant intertext, there are numerous instances where knowledge of basic themes, plot lines, modes of characterization, and literary motifs in

⁸³The mode of uniting one text (“hypertext”) with an earlier text (“hypotext”) is designated as hypertextuality by Gerard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997) 5-9. For an overview of intertextuality, see Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. T. Gora, A. Jardine, and L. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), and Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, “Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality,” in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991) 3-36.

⁸⁴The meaning created by the interplay of texts is described as the “dialogic imagination” by Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).

⁸⁵The first two chapters of Luke are perhaps the most well-known New Testament texts in terms of intertextuality (see Joel B. Green, “The Problem of a Beginning: Israel’s Scriptures in Luke 1-2,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 [1996] 61-86; idem, *Gospel of Luke*, 52-58).

ancient Greco-Roman historiography, novels, and biographies are necessitated.⁸⁶ There are a number of ways in which the reader constructs meaning from intertextual networks: (1) direct citations, with or without an introductory formula; (2) summaries of LXX history and teaching; (3) use of type scenes, constituting repetition in wording, scenery, motifs, and event sequences; (4) allusions or linguistic echoes.⁸⁷ The interplay of meaning not only occurs through the similarities between two or more texts, but by the differences, as the reader is forced to make judgments regarding the reasons for the exclusion or modification of material. Each of these four modes of intertextual networks will play a role in my discussion of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry and overarching narrative trajectories in chapter nine.

3.2.3 *Constructing Plot, Theme, Characterization, and Motifs (Topoi)*

The tendency in scholarly circles to dismiss Greco-Roman characterization as devoid of personality and thus lacking the capacity for development has been somewhat reversed in recent years. While, admittedly, the importation of jargon and methodological approaches based on modern characterization has been overdone by some, the reverse has also been true, with others overstating the claim – based on information from Aristotle that devalues the role and depiction of characterization – that change and development of character were unknown in ancient Greco-Roman narrative. Indeed, it is virtually impossible to read/listen to a narrative from Greco-Roman antiquity such as Luke-Acts without constructing personages for the various

⁸⁶There is growing recognition of Greco-Roman intertextuality in Luke-Acts; see, e.g., Sandra Schwartz, “The Trial Scene in the Greck Novels and in Acts,” in *Contextualizing Acts*, 105-33; MacDonald, “Emulation of Homer, 197-205; idem, “Shipwrecks,” 88-107; idem, “Eutychus and Homer’s Elphenor,” 4-24; Palmer, *Past as Legacy*.

⁸⁷See Richard B. Hays and Joel B. Green, “The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers,” in *Hearing the New Testament*, 226-29, for a similar delineation.

character types. Frederick W. Burnett elaborates on this nuance: “From what appears to us as a minimum of characterization may have been read in maximal terms by contemporary auditors and readers.”⁸⁸

I, therefore, wish to suggest that a better description of the difference between ancient and modern characterization would be that of psychological and individual development. The very nature of the listening process requires the implied reader to make judgments regarding the actions of characters based on their words, actions, and relationships, as well as narrative asides vis-à-vis the narrator.⁸⁹ Regardless, because narrative cannot and does not contain all of the information the implied reader needs to understand plot and characterization,⁹⁰ the implied reader must make inferences to construct and evaluate individual characters and character groups. The implied reader constructs characterization from information within and without the narrative, building consistency from the accumulation of intratextual features, importation of extratextual information, and deciphering of intertextual echoes. Few of these are obvious to the implied reader, necessitating that the implied reader embark on a process of

⁸⁸“Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels,” in *Listening to the Word of God: A Tribute to Dr. Boyce W. Blackwelder*, ed. Barry Callen (Anderson, Indiana: Warner Press, 1990) 77. Also, cf. the later adaptation, “Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels,” *Semeia* 63 (1993) 1-29.

⁸⁹For an overview, see the discussion in Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1966) 161-239. Specifically, they contend, per Greco-Roman rhetoricians, characterization ensues from *ethos*, certain traits about a character or character group from words and actions – that is, in contrast to attitudes or motives in modern narrative, elements lacking in ancient narrative

⁹⁰Note the comment of Demetrius, *On Style* 4.222: “Some points should be left to the comprehension and inference of the hearer, who when he perceives what you have left unsaid becomes not only your hearer but your witness.” Narrative providing too much information was considered exhausting work, and thus narrative requiring activity on the part of the hearer was preferential (e.g., cf. Dionysius, *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* 3, who states that Herodotus’ work is preferable to that of Thucydides because that latter lacks selectivity and thereby exhausts the reader).

construction, ultimately resulting in positive, negative, or ambivalent judgments regarding the actions and words of characters. These take place on the continuum of three levels, per Aristotle's division of character into the taxonomies of *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos*.⁹¹ Naturally, when the heuristic construct of culturally situated authorial readers is considered, the nuanced psychological effects of the narrative become even more patent.⁹²

While I agree with the widespread belief that characterization is subservient to plot in ancient narrative, I do not side with the tendency among certain scholars to dismiss characterization as a peripheral consideration. I certainly concur that characterization functions as a role within the unfolding plot lines of the narrative; actions and characters form a conceptual network from which the reader derives plot. This paradigm permits us to speak of characterization in terms of differing degrees, with certain characters or character groups playing larger roles in the plot of the narrative than others and vice versa. In addition, because the reading process is cumulative in nature, consisting of proleptic and analeptic construction, characterization is not a static entity; rather, characters are capable of ideological transformation, as the implied reader is constantly engaged in retrospective evaluation.⁹³ On a similar note, though character groups embody a matrix of traits that

⁹¹*Rhetoric* 1.2.3-1.2.6.

⁹²See, e.g., Petri Merenlahti, "Characters in the Making: Individuality and Ideology in the Gospels," in *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 49-72.

⁹³James Phelan (*Reading People, Reading Plots: Character, Progression, and the Interpretation of Narrative* [Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989] 115) explains: "the text contains not just the patterns of instabilities, tensions, and resolutions but also the authorial audience's responses to those patterns. ... we might say that progression involves not only the developing pattern of instabilities and tensions but also the accompanying

the implied reader constructs from the elements contained in the intratextual, extratextual, and intertextual repertoires, this does not dictate that all members of a composite character group manifest the same characteristics, with sporadic instances of narrators introducing new information that results in different understanding.⁹⁴

My understanding of the narrative in Luke-Acts is based on the insistence in Greco-Roman antiquity that literary works consist of actions or events comprised of a beginning, middle, and end.⁹⁵ These events or actions form a line of reversal and recognition, usually in the context of conflict between differing characters or character groups, resulting in the formation of a plot line. When done so in an effective manner, the presence of characterization permits plot to come to life. To use an illustration, characterization serves as the flesh and muscle that cause the skeletal bones of the narrative plot to function. The four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry play a pivotal role in the characterization of Luke-Acts in that speeches in Greco-Roman narrative (1) provide valuable information for judgments – analeptic and proleptic – concerning the speakers themselves; (2) reveal aspects concerning the characterization of antagonists and protagonists, both in terms of what is said regarding each but also how each respond to the actual speech and speaker; and (3) establish interpretive frameworks from which preceding and subsequent actions of characters and character

sequence of attitudes that the authorial audience is asked to take toward that pattern.” Also, cf. Christopher Gill, “The *Ethos/Pathos* Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism,” *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984) 149-66; idem, “The Character-Personality Distinction,” in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 1-31.

⁹⁴Green makes this assertion regarding the characterization of the Pharisees and disciples (*Gospel of Luke, passim*; *Theology of the Gospel*, 72-75).

⁹⁵Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1450a-1451b.

groups are evaluated.⁹⁶ All three of these will be considered in my discussion of characterization in chapter nine.

While a diversity of opinion exists on various other issues related to the narrative of Luke-Acts, recent Lukan scholarship repeatedly identifies “salvation” as the primary theme of Luke-Acts.⁹⁷ Scholars argue that salvation in Luke-Acts is predicated on the concept of benefaction, on the one hand, in which members of the state are expected to exercise their powers for the benefit of their subjects and, on the other hand, the depiction of God in the LXX as a savior of his people. In this sense, “salvation” denotes a wide range of activity, whereby role reversal occurs – inclusion of the marginalized as members of the divine community, empowerment of those without power due to social and religious maladies, and the calling for followers of Jesus to bestow “salvation” – within the purview of the patron-client paradigm – to Christians and non-Christians alike.⁹⁸ This use of theme is in reference to something different from plot, motif (*topos*), or characterization. Hence, for example, whereas plot, characterization, and motifs (*topos*) are linked to particular events and topics commensurate with a set of concrete entities, theme only involves general, abstract

⁹⁶Among other examples, see Stephen V. Tracy, *The Story of the Odyssey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), who demonstrates the pivotal role the speeches in Homer’s *Odyssey* play in the construction of characterization – both protagonists such as Telemachus, Odysseus, Penelope, and others as well as antagonists such as Antinoos, Leokritos, and others.

⁹⁷Cf. the various essays in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998).

⁹⁸Joel B. Green, “‘Salvation to the End of the Earth’ (Acts 13:47): God as the Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Witness to the Gospel*, 83-106; idem, *Theology of the Gospel*, 76-121. Also, cf. Ben Witherington III, “Salvation and Health in Christian Antiquity: The Soteriology of Luke-Acts in its First Century Setting,” in *Witness to the Gospel*, 145-65; Gary Gilbert, “Roman Propaganda and Christian Identity in the Worldview of Luke-Acts,” in *Contextualizing Acts*, 233-56.

realities such as ideas, thoughts, beliefs, and so on.⁹⁹ Accordingly, while salvation unifies the overall discourse of Luke-Acts, these elements – more indicative of the discourse – enable the narrative to shape authorial readers through ideological confirmation, reinterpretation, and disorientation. In regard to motifs (or *topoi* in accordance with Greco-Roman rhetoric¹⁰⁰), they occur in repeated instances throughout narrative, such as events, scenes, and actions, that contribute to the identification of plot lines and the construction of characterization.¹⁰¹ Motifs are the subjects around which the implied author constructs the narrative discourse (e.g., non-reciprocal benefaction), with maxims and enthymemes used as vehicles for persuasion.¹⁰² In chapter nine, my construction of narrative trajectories as a derivative

⁹⁹This understanding derives from Gerald Prince, *Narrative as Theme: Studies in French Fiction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992) 1-27. The identification of theme, or, as Prince describes it, “theming,” is connected to the context of the “themer” (“To put it even more bluntly, I always make the work I theme.” [11]). This subjective nature of reading is the reason for disagreement among scholars regarding what constitutes theme in any narrative.

¹⁰⁰For a discussion of *topos* in Greco-Roman rhetoric, see Carolyn R. Miller, “The Aristotelian *Topos*: Hunting for Novelty,” in *Rereading Aristotle’s Rhetoric*, ed. Alan G. Gross and Arthur E. Walzer (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000) 130-48; David E. Aune, “*Topos*,” in *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament & Early Christian Literature & Rhetoric* (Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003) 476.

¹⁰¹*Topoi* refers to (1) commonplaces (“themes”); (2) stock arguments or ready-made arguments for speakers to use for rhetorical situations; and (3) abstract argumentative structure or pattern. In the case of the above argument, *topoi* signify motifs such as table-fellowship, healing, promise/fulfillment, wealth/possessions, conversion, and more. None of these can be considered overarching themes, as they do not hold the narrative discourse together, but rather are elements that contribute to the overall theme of salvation and moreover move plot lines along and provide fodder for the construction of characterization. In a sense, certain *topoi* (motifs) in narrative correspond with what could be described as intratextual type-scenes (cf. Robert Alter, “How Convention Helps Us Read: The Case of the Bible’s Annunciation Type Scene,” *Prooftexts* 3 [1983] 115-30; idem, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York: Basic Books, 1981] 47-62).

¹⁰²For an overview of *topoi* and their relationship to maxims and enthymemes in ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric, see Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1.2.19-1.2.22; 2.22.13-2.23.30.

of the rhetorical texture of the four Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus will draw heavily upon this methodological framework.

3.3 Interpretation as Conduction: The Fictive and Imaginary

Readers perform a double operation of imagining and interpreting when engaging a text; the result is the formation of the text in terms of an imaginary “as-if” construction. Evolving from this is the act of ideation: readers step out of their world by configuring the textual world emerging from the functions of selection and combination into coherent modes of “imaginary” existence. A dialectical tension subsequently develops between the horizon of the text and that of the reader, resulting in the confirmation, amplification, or modification of the reader’s self-understanding. This act of ideation occurs on the part of both the implied reader and that of the real flesh-and-blood reader; the difference between the two is the ability of the real flesh-and-blood reader to assess the narrative discourse from the perspective of conduction, whereby judgments are made regarding narrator, plot, theme, *topoi*, and characterization. This mode of assessment by real readers can even extend to authorial readers, a step that I will discuss in chapter ten.

Drawing upon the hermeneutical framework of Iser, I propose that the metamorphosis in the ideological systems of the authorial audience takes place in several ways.¹⁰³ “Gaps” are places where readers must supply missing information in order to make sense of the narrative. These include abrupt changes in geographical location, failure to comment on the response of characters to actions in the narrative, open-ended plot lines, plus various breaks or intrusions in the narrative. The four

¹⁰³*Act of Reading*, 163-239; idem, *Prospecting*, 33-41.

speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry contain a number of textual “gaps” that prompt the implied reader to engender meaning through interpretive decisions, ranging from geographical changes at the beginning of the speeches, to repetition, to rhetorical play, to narrative asides.

“Blanks” are places where readers must connect openings between textual perspectives (e.g., narrator, characters, plot, etc.). Use of irony is perhaps the most frequent use of this device in biblical narrative, whereby the implied reader is privy to information not available to the characters in the story via narrative asides or even previous information in the narrative. Irony plays an important role in the four speeches in that the implied reader possesses information of which the narrative audience is not aware. This aids the implied reader in building judgments about various characters and character groups comprising the narrative audience; their reactions to Jesus’ speeches disclose aspects of their *ethos*.

“Negations” constitute places where familiar elements or knowledge are invoked but then canceled out, inducing the various constituents of the authorial audience to modify their position in relation to the text. An important component in this interpretive approach is the premise that authors work within the constraints of their historical and social milieu yet also remain autonomous enough to challenge some of these constraints. My investigation of the narrative discourse will push beyond the boundaries of the text to establish linkages to the ideological systems within which the text was produced.¹⁰⁴ Robert Wuthnow explains the process:

¹⁰⁴See the hermeneutical questions Stephen Greenblatt (“Culture,” in *Johns Hopkins*, 226) contends need to be posed:

What kinds of behavior, what models of practice, does this work seem to enforce? Why might readers at a particular time and place find this work compelling? Are there differences between my values and the values implicit in

... [individual texts] draw resources, insights, and inspiration from their social environment: they reflect it, speak to it, and make themselves relevant to it. And yet they also remain autonomous enough from their social environment to acquire a broader, even universal and timeless appeal. The process of articulation is thus characterized by a delicate balance between the products of culture and the social environment in which they are produced.¹⁰⁵

In this model, certain meaning-making dimensions of a text simply correspond with the social and historical framework from which the author is operating, while other meaning-making dimensions may challenge particular facets of this framework.¹⁰⁶

Of the three meaning-making dimensions, “negations” have received the least amount of attention in biblical studies, and examination of the four Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus are no exception. Accordingly, in chapter ten, I will explore instances of sociological “negation,” places where the ideological systems represented in the narrative discourse extend, alter, or even challenge those of the authorial audience. Specifically, the discourse of the four speeches does not simply mirror the ideological systems of the authorial audience, but rather concurrently expands upon, reinterprets, and even challenges those same systems. Additionally, I will demonstrate that appropriation of the rhetorical texture of the speeches and their resulting narrative

the work I am reading? Upon what social understandings does the work depend? Whose freedom of thought or movement might be constrained implicitly or explicitly by this work? What are the larger social structures with which these particular acts of praise or blame might be connected?

¹⁰⁵*Communities of Discourse*, 3. Also, Richard Freadman and Seumas Miller, *Rethinking Theory: A Critique of Contemporary Literary Theory and an Alternative Account* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 233: “... authors and their texts are not wholly determined by their socio-historical context: though some textual meanings will be so conditioned, others will reflect the fact that authors can to some extent transcend their socio-historical contexts.”

¹⁰⁶This approach is taken by Green in respect to the characterization of Mary, the mother of Jesus, in the Lukan prologue (“Social Status of Mary,” 457-71).

trajectories differs based on the ideological location of the authorial reader, with the effect being variations in the meanings produced. For example, authorial readers with material possessions will construe the hermeneutical implications of the second speech (Lk 6.20-49) differently than authorial readers with a paucity of material possessions.

4 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

The hermeneutical process of conduction opens up new horizons, as flesh-and-blood readers engage the attitudes that the narrative discourse imposes upon the implied reader. The subsequent move is to encounter the otherness of what the text represents, with the result engendering the formation of new modes of ethical, social, political, and religious being.¹⁰⁷ Biblical texts are comprised of a variety of perspectives that outline the implied author's view, providing authorial readers with the means to engage the "otherness" of the text. When speaking in terms of the narrative discourse in Luke-Acts, I propose the identification of six different perspectives: (1) narrators – both the first-person narrator present in much of the narrative and the we-narrator that appears at the latter end of Acts (point-of-view); (2) plot – which, as discussed, in ancient narrative parallels theme; (3) characterization; (4) *topoi* (or motifs); (5) the implied reader – a text-based function that is guided by the implied author; and (6) the authorial audience – hypothetical audience as represented by an extratextual heuristic construct embodying varying cultural systems.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷This is called for in the secular reading of texts by Jane P. Tompkins, "The Reader in History: The Changing Shape of Literary Response," in *Reader-Response: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980) 224-26. Also, Stephen E. Fowl and L. Gregory Jones, *Reading in Communion: Scripture and Ethics in Christian Life* (Grand Rapids and London: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991).

¹⁰⁸See Iser, *Prospecting*, 33-41, for a similar delincation.

The encounter of authorial readers with these perspectives produces an intertwined network of relationships, resulting in the ideation of a new horizon, which they move in and out of in order to reflect upon and even to assess their own reactions. My conductive reading of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts – vis-à-vis the narrative trajectories generated by the rhetorical argument of the four speeches found in the Galilean ministry of Jesus (Lk 4.14-9.50) – will critically evaluate each of these perspectives and their appropriation by the authorial audience. The goal is to move the discussion of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts – specifically in regard to the four speeches – towards a deeper understanding of those who first heard the narrative read and, in particular, some of the potential ways in which the narrative confirms, reinterprets, and challenges ideological locations.

3

GRECO-ROMAN RHETORIC ARGUMENT: DELIMITING RHETORICAL TEXTURE

That the New Testament is imbued with Greco-Roman rhetorical argument is now widely acknowledged.¹ Various articles and books have been written on the ways in which New Testament letters – and, to a lesser extent, the Gospels² – exhibit a close affinity with rhetorical forms and devices. The presence of Greco-Roman rhetoric in Luke-Acts is also not a novel idea, with a number of scholars noting the use of rhetorical speech forms and devices. By far, the speeches in Acts have received the preponderance of attention, with particular focus on the three defense speeches of Paul in chapters 22, 25, and 26. Perhaps the most representative of this is the recent commentary on Acts by Witherington, whereby he explores the narrative discourse

¹See among others, Vernon K. Robbins, “The Present and Future State of Rhetorical Analysis,” in *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 146; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 32-41; Jan Lambrecht, S.J., “Rhetorical Criticism and the New Testament,” *Bijdragen* 50 (1989) 239-53; C. Clifton Black II, “Keeping up with Recent Studies: Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation,” *Expository Times* 100 (1988/89) 252-58.

²For the relationship of narrative and rhetoric in Greco-Roman antiquity, see Vernon K. Robbins, “Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1996 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 368-84. Also, cf. Satterthwaite, “Classical Rhetoric,” 337-79.

from the lens of Greco-Roman rhetorical categories.³ The use of ancient rhetorical conventions in the narrative of Luke, however, in contrast to that of Acts, though examined in passing, has not been thoroughly investigated.⁴ And to take it a step further, few have paid attention to the ways in which the rhetorical argument of Jesus' speeches from the Galilean ministry, and resulting narrative discourse, shape the hermeneutical appropriation of the authorial audience. While an integral component in my investigation, the latter will be discussed in chapters nine and ten. In the next four chapters, I will concentrate on the rhetorical texture, representative of the implied author's deployment of intertextual, intratextual, and extratextual repertoire and the construction of coherence and consistency by the implied reader.

1 GRECO-ROMAN HANDBOOK RHETORIC

In the 1980s, a significant contingent of biblical scholars embarked on a search to locate rhetorical patterns – as primarily delineated in the ancient rhetorical handbooks – within the New Testament. At the core of their rhetorical investigation was the seminal work of George A. Kennedy, who – based on the ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks – proposed a five-stage approach in examining texts from antiquity: (1) definition of the rhetorical unit; (2) adumbration of the rhetorical situation; (3) identification of the rhetorical disposition and arrangement; (4) examination of rhetorical techniques and style; and (5) evaluation of rhetorical criticism

³*Acts*, esp. 39-50. Also, Soards, *Speeches in Acts*, *passim*.

⁴This is also the observation of Mikeal C. Parsons, "Luke and the *Progymnasmata*: A Preliminary Investigation into the Preliminary Exercises," in *Contextualizing Acts*, 44: "Nonetheless, with some notable exceptions scholars have been reluctant to apply these insights to the Gospel of Luke and the narrative portions of Acts." Two exceptions are Diefenbach, *Komposition des Lukasevangeliums* and Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian*.

as a synchronic whole.⁵ Application of Kennedy's model is widespread, ranging from the rhetorical structure and argumentation of the Pauline and non-Pauline letters to the speeches of the four Gospels as well as those of Acts.

1.1 Rhetorical Invention, Arrangement, and Style

According to Kennedy, when demarcating the rhetorical situation, the focus must be on the premises of the ascribed text as appeal or argument, that is, the complex of persons, events, and relations generating the impetus for a verbal response. The situation controls the rhetorical response, the question controls the answer, and the problem controls the solution.⁶ Kennedy defines rhetorical disposition and arrangement as "what subdivisions a text falls into, what the persuasive effect of these parts seems to be, and how they work together – or fail to do so – to some unified purpose in meeting the rhetorical situation."⁷ Rhetorical invention, according to the handbooks, consists of three different *species* (invention): judiciary, deliberative, and epideictic. Judicial speeches, with the law court as their setting, focus on the speaker's desire to convince the audience of past actions by means of accusation or defense. Deliberative speeches, with legislative settings as their contextual frame, pertain to future events, with the speaker aspiring to persuade or dissuade the audience about a

⁵*New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1984) 33-38.

⁶Kennedy follows Lloyd F. Bitzer's understanding of the argumentative or rhetorical situation ("The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 [1968] 1-14). Bitzer contends that "a particular discourse comes into existence because of some specific condition or situation that invites utterance. The situation controls the rhetorical response in the same sense that the question controls the answer and the problem controls the solution." (4-6)

⁷*Through Rhetorical Criticism*, 37.

course of action intended for the future. Epideictic speeches, with the public assembly as their setting, refer to present events, drawing on praise or blame in an attempt to bring about honor or shame on the individual or group of individuals in question.⁸

Greco-Roman oratory, as taught in the tertiary phases of education, consists of five parts: (1) invention – the planning of a discourse and arguments used in it;⁹ (2) arrangement – the composition of the different parts into a whole;¹⁰ (3) style – the choice of words and placement of them into sentences, including the use of figures;¹¹ (4) memory – the preparation for delivery; and (5) delivery – the control of the voice and use of gestures.¹² Most who draw upon the rhetorical handbooks utilize the first three parts, though there has been an increasing amount of attention paid to the latter two, particularly in regard to the fact that reading in Greco-Roman society was an

⁸Because most of the New Testament letters and speeches do not easily fall into one of the three *species*, a number of scholars contend there is often a utilization of more than one *species*. Note the comment of Kennedy: “In a single discourse there is sometimes more than one *species*, and the definition of the *species* as a whole can become very difficult, but a discourse usually has one dominant *species* that reflects the author’s major purpose in speaking or writing” (*ibid.*, 19). As I will argue below, the inability of scholars to locate close correspondence between the *species* of New Testament letters and speeches and one *species* alone is a reflection that the rhetorical conventions in the handbooks embody a different rhetorical category and thus cannot be imported directly without appropriate “filtering” for analysis of New Testament texts.

⁹For an overview of “invention” in ancient rhetoric, see Malcolm Heath, “Invention,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill Publishing, 1997) 89-119.

¹⁰For an overview of “arrangement” in ancient rhetoric, see Wilhelm Wuellner, “Arrangement,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 51-88.

¹¹For an overview of “style” in ancient rhetoric, see Galen O. Rowe, “Style,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 121-57.

¹²For an overview of “memory” and “delivery” in ancient rhetoric, see Thomas H. Olbricht, “Delivery and Memory,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 159-70.

oral/aural experience and certain rhetorical conventions in the New Testament coincide with the presentation requirements surrounding memory and delivery.¹³

Judicial speeches consist of five basic parts. An *exordium* (or *proem*) seeks to obtain the goodwill and attention of the audience; the *narratio* (or statement of facts) specifies the objectives of the speech; the *proof* details the speaker's arguments, with a *refutation* of opposing views; and the *conclusio* (or *epilogue*) summarizes the speech's primary arguments and seeks to bring about a judgment or action on the part of the audience. The deliberative speech has the same elements, minus the refutation. An epideictic speech also reflects a similar arrangement, with the addition of *ecphrasis* (vivid description) and *synkrisis* (comparison).

1.2 Rhetorical Handbooks and New Testament Rhetoric

Difficulties in a *carte blanche* use of rhetorical frameworks contained within the ancient rhetorical handbooks to analyze the New Testament writings began to be recognized in the 1990s.¹⁴ The breakdown revolves around the contextual differences

¹³See, e.g., Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998) 163-68; Ray Nadeau, "Delivery in Ancient Times: Homer to Quintilian," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 50 (1964) 53-60. Also, cf. Whitney Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2003), *passim*, for an analysis of memory and delivery in relationship to the Gospel of Mark.

¹⁴The most prominent and thorough criticism of those who use the rhetorical handbooks for analyzing the New Testament is that of Philip H. Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an approach to Paul's epistle* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 101; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). He places rhetoric into four separate categories: (1) level one rhetoric: effective communication that draws on universal rhetorical strategies; (2) level two rhetoric: persuasive speech that aims to persuade the audience to accept a new position; (3) level three rhetoric: form of verbal discourse that conforms to specific patterns of expression determined by the group to which the speaker belongs; and (4) level four: rhetoric discourse deployed in specific venues. As the venues for the New Testament writings and classical handbooks are disparate, Kern argues that it is impossible to analyze New Testament texts vis-à-vis the handbooks. Instead, he concludes that

between the rhetoric of the ancient handbooks and that of the New Testament. Ancient oratory and the rhetoric of the New Testament epistles are not of the same genre and, while rhetorical texture overlaps into epistolary conventions, this does not necessitate that they be viewed as the same – a conclusion reached by many who took up rhetorical criticism in the 1980s and 1990s.¹⁵ Specifically, the category of rhetoric espoused in the ancient handbooks is formulated for formal oratory settings – judiciary, deliberative, and epideictic – and not for written communication to specific communities.¹⁶ In addition, rhetorical study in antiquity focused on court and assembly oratory – guidelines for public speaking. As such, those who received training in the rhetoric of the ancient handbooks were a very small group, and the likelihood that any of the New Testament writers received formal rhetorical training is doubtful.¹⁷

while the rhetorical handbooks represent level four rhetoric, the New Testament simply coincides as level two rhetoric – rhetorical analysis should examine the texts using rhetorical categories with universal appeal. While I concur with Kern’s contention that the rhetoric of the New Testament does not fit the parameters of handbook rhetoric, I demur on the categorization of the New Testament as level two rhetoric. Rather, as the New Testament is enmeshed within the constraints of Greco-Roman antiquity, a presupposition pool upon which the implied author and implied reader draw, I contend that it more closely coincides with level three rhetoric.

I would like to thank Professor Loveday C.A. Alexander for calling my attention to this monograph and to credit Professor Alexander and Professor John M.G. Barclay for their recommendations to re-evaluate my initial analysis of the four Lukan Galilean speeches, though neither are responsible for deficiencies or errors in my theoretical formulation and subsequent rhetorical analysis.

¹⁵Stanley E. Porter (“Paul of Tarsus and His Letters,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 533-86) raises four cautionary observations: (1) rhetorical interpretations yield different results as to the genre and arrangement of individual documents; (2) the Roman and Greek rhetorical sources are used in an opportunistic manner; (3) the amount of epistolary material considered by each scholar as rhetorical widely varies from scholar to scholar; and (4) rhetorical and epistolary structures often do not coincide, thereby creating a “stumbling block” for most interpreters. (561)

¹⁶For an in-depth discussion, see Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians*, 12-38.

¹⁷However, cf. Jerome H. Neyrey, “The Social Location of Paul: Education as the Key,” in *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*, ed. David B. Gowler, L. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane F. Watson (Harrisburg, London, and New York: Trinity

Conversely, for those who contend that most were exposed to rhetoric in the vein of the handbooks and thus the New Testament writers simply drew upon this assimilated knowledge, it is doubtful that the bulk of the populace attended court and assemblies, the two venues where handbook rhetoric would have been practiced.¹⁸

The lynchpin holding together analysis of New Testament letters via ancient handbook rhetoric involves the contention that letter writing and oratory were not disparate enterprises. It is becoming increasingly evident, however, that the two were not integrated until centuries after the first century CE.¹⁹ Letter writing was not of interest to the rhetoricians; rather, the rhetorical handbooks occasionally refer to epistolary conventions in order to highlight differences in the arena of style – with invention and arrangement not in purview.²⁰

A final issue relates to the literary level of early Christian communication. The rhetorical argument of the New Testament and, for the most part, early Christianity does not fall into the vein of that deemed as classical rhetoric.²¹ The closest resembling the upper hierarchy would be the Epistle to the Hebrews and the prefaces to Luke

Press International, 2003) 157-64.

¹⁸Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians*, 61-66.

¹⁹See Edward P.J. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric and the Modern Student* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965) 20.

²⁰See, e.g., Stanley E. Porter, “The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to Pauline Epistolary Literature,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 108-16.

²¹The basis for pinpointing the differences in Hellenistic Greek and New Testament Greek is the work of Adolf Deissmann, “Hellenistic Greek with Special Consideration of the Greek Bible,” in *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991) 39-59.

(1.1-4) and Acts (1.1-2), though beneath the most prestigious classical modes of rhetoric. The remainder of the New Testament reflects the language of the main of the populace, a literary level, while far from the bottom of the literary hierarchy, that certainly does not coincide with the invention, arrangement, and style typically associated with classical rhetoric.²²

2 DELIMITING THE PARAMETERS OF RHETORICAL TEXTURE

The aforementioned, however, does not result in a complete dissolution between New Testament rhetoric and the rhetorical conventions contained within the ancient handbooks. Rather than examining New Testament texts based on rhetorical invention and arrangement and, to a lesser extent, rhetorical style, as defined within the handbook tradition, I suggest that we do so in terms of rhetorical texture. A rhetorical analysis of the New Testament – or in the case of this study, Luke-Acts – does not place the rhetorical conventions of the handbooks alongside New Testament text with the anticipation of mirrored structures or patterns coming into immediate focus. Instead, rhetorical texture, comprised of argument with a goal of persuasion, is a more appropriate methodological approach. It does not adhere to a rigid mode of invention and arrangement but aspects of argumentation – deductive and inductive. Derivation comes from standard modes of argumentation, *topoi* (“common-place” arguments) not only found in the handbooks but various other texts as well. Further, concern is less

²²See the conclusions of Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians*, 247-55. Also, see Thomas H. Olbricht, “An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians,” in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malberbe*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 216-36, who argues that early Christianity developed its own distinctive rhetorical *topoi*.

with genre and structure and more with effective argumentation – namely, the use of rhetorical *topoi* familiar to the audience.

As will become apparent via my investigation of the four Galilean speeches of Jesus in Luke, these *topoi* involve all three textual dimensions – intertextual, intratextual, and extratextual. Of the rhetorical proofs found in the rhetorical handbooks, the most relevant for the study of the New Testament is that of style, as its primary concern is with the ways in which the audience appropriate rhetorical argument.²³

As scholars search for alternative sources to analyze New Testament rhetoric, one group of texts receiving significant scrutiny in recent years are the handbooks of *progymnasmata* – exercises used in the secondary schools (usually boys between the age of twelve and fifteen) of Greco-Roman antiquity for preliminary rhetorical training.²⁴ The curriculum in the *progymnasmata* features a series of pedagogical exercises that served as the basis for written and oral expression, with a focus on how to engage effectively in dialectical debate. Issues related to invention and arrangement, which receive significant attention in the rhetorical handbooks, do not garner mention in the *progymnasmata*. The exercises rather examine rhetorical conventions useful in

²³This assessment of style – as opposed to the less universal categories of invention and arrangement – coincides with that of Rowe (“Style,” 121): “. . . the ancient precepts on style apply to any verbal expression and not simply to that which is used to persuade. These precepts inform poetry as well as prose, historical writings, philosophical essays, and letters as well as political and forensic speeches. . . . the criteria, the so-called virtues (ἀρεταί/*virtutes*) of correctness, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety, form the basis of the entire classical theory.”

²⁴For an introduction and translation to the *progymnasmata*, see George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks and Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World, 10; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003). There are four extant *progymnasmata*: Aelius Theon (late first century BCE), Hermogenes of Tarsus (second century CE), Aphthonius the Sophist (fourth century CE), and Nicolaus the Sophist (fifth century CE).

Luke-Acts uses rhetorical questioning as a means for demarcating characterization –

specifically in regard to the characterization of Jesus and his disciples in contrast with persuasive argument within the context of three modes of communication: chreia, their opponents. Hence, for the implied reader, the argument of Jesus and his disciples fable, and narration. Overlap with the rhetorical handbooks occurs on the level of coincides with the logical protocols of the world and life, whereas the argument of rhetorical style and its use in successful argumentation, ranging from maxim, to their opponents runs counter to the norms of world and life.

enthymeme, to repetition, to *ecphrasis* (vivid description), to *synkrisis* (comparison).

When rhetorical questioning is delineated in an uninterrupted series, the result

It now is commonly held that all texts are ideologically located – reflecting is a heightening of the aural/oral impact. Series of rhetorical questions also serve to social, political, religious, gender, and other biases. Narrative discourse is inescapably illustrate – to the implied reader – the utter lack of *logos* on the part of the opponents enmeshed within certain cultural constructs, with the implied author – both of Jesus and his disciples (viz., they are not only at odds with one precept of life or the intentionally and unintentionally – using rhetorical texture as a vehicle for bringing world but a number). Both the second (Lk 6.20-49) and third (Lk 7.24-35) Galilean about a response on the part of the authorial audience. In this context, rhetorical speeches of Jesus employ the latter; the consequence is an incremental gradation in the texture affects the ways in which authorial readers might actualize the narrative amplification of argument that reaches its apex with the final rhetorical question (e.g., discourse – namely, ways in which it reinforces, reinterprets, and confronts the Jesus’ questions regarding John the Baptist in Lk 7.24-27). ideological beliefs of the authorial audience.²⁵ Accordingly, my analysis of the four

Galilean speeches of Jesus in Luke will begin by examining rhetorical texture in terms

of argumentative style and, conventionally, the rhetorical proof of the discourse, for its

ideological genetics, ways based on the rhetorical text. So persons as authorial readers

to make certain judgments concerning issues such as plot, theme, characterization, and

topoi.

2.1 ²⁷Demetrius, *On Style*, 278-279; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.16; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 9.3.90-9.3.98; Cicero, *De Oratore*, 3.54.207.

One nuance of rhetorical texture that largely transcends the rhetorical

CHAPTER 3: *Greco-Roman Rhetorical Argument: Delimiting Rhetorical Texture*

handbooks is Aristotle’s delineation of rhetorical proof as consisting of *logos*, *pathos*,

Page -91-

²⁵Cf. Wilhelm Wuellner who has been pivotal in helping to push classical rhetorical analysis into the realms of discourse and ideological systems and the ways in which these exercise persuasive power during the mode of hermeneutical appropriation – both for readers in antiquity and readers today (see, e.g., “Hermeneutics and Rhetorics: From ‘Truth and Method’ to ‘Truth and Power’,” *Scriptura* 3 [1989] 1-54; idem, “Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 [1987] 448-63).

and *ethos*. The latter refers to character, establishing the credibility of the speaker. It serves an important role in the characterization of Jesus in Luke and that of the major protagonists in Acts. Negative caricatures in Luke-Acts also draw upon the proof of *ethos*. *Pathos* refers to the ability of the speaker to evince an emotive response from the audience. Of the three rhetorical proofs, *pathos* is the least relevant for my investigation of Luke-Acts, though there are places where it is evident. *Logos* is the most encompassing rhetorical proof, consisting of both inductive and deductive reasoning. Inductive argument uses examples and stories as well as various rhetorical devices to persuade or dissuade the audience. One aspect of doing so – since ancient rhetoric was done for the ear and not for the eye, aural and not visual – was by means of sound, whereby the use of repetition was used to elicit a response from the audience. Deductive argumentation utilizes rhetorical questioning, maxims, and enthymemes. The argumentation of the latter two – namely, maxims and enthymemes – revolves around *topoi* (or motifs) embedded within the rhetorical discourse.²⁶ The four Galilean speeches in Luke include significant deductive and inductive argument, aspects of their rhetorical texture that will be covered in detail in chapters four, five, six, and seven.

2.2 Rhetorical Questioning

Rhetorical questioning typically assumes that the audience agrees with the presupposed answer. The response to the question is often left unanswered, with the assumption that the audience – both the narrative audience and implied reader –

²⁶Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.22.13-2.23.30. Also, see the *progymnasmata*: Thcon, 96-106; Hermogenes, 8c-10; Aphthonius, 25b-27b; Nicolaus, 25-29a.

answers correctly.²⁷ The use of *logos* in rhetorical questioning serves as a form of power, with the implied reader prompted to view the protagonist(s) in a positive light – speaking with authority and using logical proofs – and the antagonist(s) in a negative light – lacking authority and without logical proofs. In particular, the implied author of

reason, whereas others include a reason.²⁸ Specifically, when maxims state something contrary to general opinion they require a supporting reason. For example, the conclusion “a student who spends significant time preparing for exams is deceived in thinking she is assured of attaining high grades” requires the accompanying reason: “painstaking preparation for exams is just one of several factors that determine the performance of a student.” These types of maxims, of course, often blur the lines of demarcation between maxims and enthymemes, as these more complex maxims actually exhibit enthymematic argument.²⁹ The rhetorical function of maxims is for the sake of argument and not simply to dispense moral axioms. At the same time, they imbue speeches with *ethos* – namely, credibility – through their use of commonly accepted opinions (viz., *topoi*).

2.4 Enthymemes

Enthymemes have received a spate of attention in the past decade in New Testament scholarship. David E. Aune recently questions some of the underlying assumptions of the methodological approach of these investigations. Some of the key reasons he cites include: (1) Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* – upon which much of rhetorical investigation of the New Testament is based – was largely unknown during the first century CE; (2) the premises of enthymematic argument are based on probabilities and not certainties (which largely runs counter to most analysis by New Testament

²⁸It is unclear as to whether these instances – maxim plus a reason – qualify as actual enthymemes or simply resemble enthymematic argument; cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.21.6: “As for the maxims that are accompanied by an epilogue (viz., reason), some partake of the nature of, but not of the form of, enthymemes.” Also, see Theon, 96-97; Hermogenes, 8b-10; Aphthonius, 25b-27c; Nicolaus, 25-29 for a discussion of maxim within the *progymnasmata*.

²⁹Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.21.1-2.21.16; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.17; Demetrius, *On Style*, 9.

scholars); and (3) enthymemes cannot be restricted simply to truncated syllogisms (viz., a conclusion and premise with a missing premise that must be deduced by the audience).³⁰ In regard to the latter, Aune contends – on the basis of Demetrius and Quintilian – that enthymemes in the first century CE comprise four different forms: (1) a thought; (2) an inference from consequents or contraries; (3) a rhetorical syllogism; and (4) incomplete (or truncated) syllogism.³¹ Aune subsequently proceeds to fault New Testament scholarship on the basis that three of the four enthymematic forms are largely neglected, focusing almost exclusively on the truncated syllogism.

Aune provides a valuable critique of enthymematic investigation in New Testament scholarship, specifically the need to look at enthymematic argument beyond that of incomplete syllogism, and the fact that some scholars have pushed the presence of enthymemes beyond the constraints of supporting reason (viz., when the syllogisms are retraced, the reasoning disintegrates). Notwithstanding, his analysis is unconvincing on two primary fronts. On the one hand, the dismissal of Aristotelean influence on the Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks and moreover the New Testament writers is nebulous; there is evidence of several first century CE writers – and quite possibly Demetrius and Quintilian, as well as the *Progymnasmata* handbook of Aelius Theon –

³⁰“The Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme in New Testament Scholarship,” *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003) 299-320, esp. 302-07; idem, “Enthymeme,” in *Westminster Dictionary*, 150-57.

³¹Aune (*ibid.*, 300-01) posits a fifth enthymematic form in Quintilian (a maxim supported by a reason) but seemingly dismisses it as irrelevant since it is not found in Demetrius. His almost immediate dismissal requires some form of reasoning, which he fails to provide. Further, simply because it is lacking in Demetrius is not sufficient evidence to excise it from purview (viz., on the basis that it was not a common component of rhetorical systems of the first century CE).

who knew of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and drew upon it.³² In short, there is a difference between showing appropriate caution in the "wholesale" application of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* to the New Testament and dispensing with it as irrelevant.³³ On the other hand, Aune's four-fold distinction between different enthymematic forms is questionable. The passage in Demetrius (*On Style*, 30-33) that Aune concludes specifies four different enthymematic forms is certainly not clear on the matter. Indeed, Demetrius seems to denote the enthymeme as a *thought* that can be expressed in two different *ways*: either as a contrast or as a logical consequence (*On Style*, 30). The subsequent reference to the enthymeme as a rhetorical syllogism and incomplete syllogism (*On Style*, 32) is a further definition of the enthymeme (in contradistinction to the period) and not additional enthymematic forms (or even *ways* in which they can be expressed). In sum, nowhere is it apparent that Demetrius is delineating four separate forms of the enthymeme. Aune's examination of the passages from Quintilian also exhibits a tendency to identify a multiplicity of enthymematic forms. In particular, *contra* Aune, Quintilian, like Demetrius, appears to adumbrate two basic modes of enthymematic expression – as a consequence or as a contrast.³⁴ Further, denotation of the enthymeme as a "thought" is simply an overarching description and not a mode of expression. Discussion of the form of an enthymeme as a rhetorical syllogism or

³²Cicero, *De inventione*, 1.7; Dionysius, *Epistle ad Ammaeum*, 1.6-9; Demetrius, *On Style*, 34; Theon, 61b. See George A. Kennedy, "The Composition and Influence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*," in *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. A.O. Rorty (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1996) 416-24.

³³Aune's methodological approach is "muddy" in that he spends significant time detailing enthymematic argument according to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (*ibid.*, 302-06) but then quickly dismisses the work as irrelevant for New Testament rhetorical investigation (*ibid.*, 306-07).

³⁴Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 5.10.2; 14.1.1.

incomplete syllogism in Quintilian (or, for that matter, a maxim supported by a reason – the enthymematic “form” Aune identifies as present in Quintilian but not Demetrius) is as explanation of and not in addition to the modes of expression (viz., as a consequence or in contrast). As a result of the above synopsis, in my judgment, Aune’s division of enthymematic forms in Demetrius and Quintilian is deficient, and thus further scrutiny is required.

With the aforementioned at the forefront, what can be said regarding enthymematic argument and New Testament studies and, most notably, the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts? ³⁵ First, some enthymemes occur as incomplete (or truncated) syllogisms. Here it is important to note that the constructed syllogism must exhibit “reverse engineering” in which the different parts of the syllogism can be identified: a major premise, minor premise, and conclusion, with one of the three implicit, typically one of the premises – and the requirement for the audience to fill it. The missing premise must be a common notion widely accepted by the audience and is filled through deductive reasoning. ³⁶ The conclusion of the incomplete syllogism must be reached via combination of the major premise – universal probability and acceptable by definition – and minor premise – more specific but also generally acceptable. The

³⁵Though faulty in his overly rigid classification of all clauses with γάρ and ὅτι as minor premises of an enthymematic argument, see Richard B. Vison, “A Comparative Study of the Use of Enthymemes in the Synoptic Gospels,” in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson (Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 50; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 93-118, for an overview of enthymemes in Luke.

³⁶Note the comment of Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, 2.23.30): “But of all syllogisms, whether refutative or demonstrative, those are specially applauded, the result of which the hearers foresee as soon as they are begun, and not because they are superficial (for as they listen they congratulate themselves on anticipating the conclusion); and also those which the hearers are only so little behind that they understand what they mean as soon as they are delivered.”

following is a fairly simple, straight-forward example of an incomplete syllogism: college students who fail to attend class typically do not receive passing grades, because preparation for exams takes place during class sessions. Reconstruction of the enthymematic argument results in the identification of the *conclusion*, college students who fail to attend class typically do not receive passing grades, and the *major premise*, preparation for exams takes place during class sessions. Simply implied in the rhetorical argument, the *minor premise*, a commonly accepted probability (viz., exams are a key component of the grading process), must be filled in by the audience. The four Galilean ministry speeches each contain examples of this enthymematic form, ranging from the introduction to the first speech (4.18-19), to various aspects of the body of the second speech (6.32-45), to portions of the body of the third speech (7.32-34), to the conclusion of the fourth speech (8.16-18).

Second, enthymemes serve to either refute or demonstrate, with the juxtaposition of two elements as the most popular mode of argumentation.³⁷ A conjunctive (e.g., ὅτι, γάρ) often separates the two parts of the enthymeme. A syllogistic formula is not a requisite in order for a rhetorical argument to be classified as an enthymeme. Refutative enthymemes draw their conclusions from facts that are disputed (often by an adversary), whereas demonstrative enthymemes draw their conclusions from generally accepted facts (admitted by the adversary). The following is an example of a refutative enthymeme: the *conclusion*, money can be put to bad use and therefore is not good, derives from the combination of the *major premise*, money

³⁷Albeit Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, 2.23.30) makes the claim that enthymemes that refute are preferable to those that demonstrate because of their use of opposites in the formulation of argumentation, he concurrently posits the use of *opposites* as one mode of argumentation that can be used when employing a demonstrative enthymeme (*Rhetoric*, 2.23.23).

is not a good thing, and *minor premise*, that which is not good can be put to a bad use.³⁸ Refutative enthymemes in the four Galilean ministry speeches are found in the introduction to the second speech (6.20-26) and the body of the third speech (7.31-34). The following is an example of a demonstrative enthymeme: the *conclusion*, a student should spend significant time studying for her exam, results from the combination of the *major premise*, the student received poor grades on prior exams when she failed to study, and *minor premise*, significant time studying results in good grades. The four speeches in the Galilean ministry include a number of demonstrative enthymemes such as the latter part of the body of the second speech (6.43-45) and the conclusion of the fourth speech (8.16-18).

Third, as Aune and others point out, enthymemes also occur in the form of contraries in which two opposite statements are juxtaposed. The following is an example of this type of enthymematic argument: the *statement*, rain causes the grass to grow, when combined with the *premise*, grass withers without moisture, results in the following *conclusion*: lack of rainfall produces withered grass. Within the context of my investigation, the most obvious instance of this form of enthymematic argument is the introduction to the second Galilean ministry speech (Lk 6.20-26). The premise of the third speech also employs two opposites in the form of an enthymematic argument (7.28).

Fourth, enthymematic argument in the New Testament includes the use of abductive reasoning, rhetorical argument that uses transcendent *topoi* – which cannot be seen – to suggest similarities between the transcendent and the reality of earthly

³⁸See Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 5.14.25.

experiences.³⁹ This is important in that the actions of the divine establish a precedent for humans to emulate. In the context of enthymematic argument, different attributes and actions of the divine stand as major and/or minor premises. For example, the *conclusion*, children of God should show benefaction to the poor without expectation of reciprocity, and the *major premise*, God shows benefaction to the poor without expectation of reciprocity, yields the *minor premise* (implied), children of God emulate the actions of the divine. The enthymematic argument comprising the enthymematic rationale concluding the first section of the body in the second speech (6.36) corresponds with the abductive form of argument.

Fifth, enthymematic argument is a mode of persuasion through which *topoi* – symbolic systems representing recognizable premises – provide a means for deductive association or disassociation.⁴⁰ The premises of enthymemes are not certainties but rather probabilities expressed through the use of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*.⁴¹ Aristotle cites four sources for enthymematic argument: probabilities, examples, necessary signs, and signs.⁴² In that they make for more effective argument, most of the enthymemes in the four speeches of the Galilean ministry use probabilities and examples as their *topoi*.

³⁹See Richard L. Lanigan, “From Enthymeme to Abduction: The Classical Law of Logic and the Postmodern Rule of Rhetoric,” in *Recovering Pragmatism’s Voice: The Classical Tradition, Rorty, and the Philosophy of Communication*, ed. Lenore Langsdorf and Andrew R. Smith (Albany, New York: SUNY Press, 1995) 49-70; Bruce J. Malina, “Interpretation: Reading, Abduction, Metaphor,” in *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. David Jobling, et al. (Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1991) 253-66.

⁴⁰See, e.g., Thomas B. Farrell, “Aristotle’s Enthymeme as Tacit Reference,” in *Rereading Aristotle’s Rhetoric*, 93-106.

⁴¹See Antoine C. Braet, “Ethos, Pathos, and Logos in Aristotle’s ‘*Rhetoric*’: A Re-examination,” *Argumentation* 6 (1992) 307-20, who argues that *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* comprise enthymematic argument in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*.

⁴²*Rhetoric*, 2.25.8-2.25.14.

Ultimately, enthymematic networks invite the implied reader to search for *topoi* elsewhere, both within and outside the text (encompassing the intratext, extratext, and intertext).⁴³ An instance of *topoi* from outside of the text is the conclusion to the fourth speech (8.16-18), which assumes an extratextual repertoire, requisite knowledge that the narrative audience and implied reader must tap in order to enact coherence. Also, as already mentioned above, abductive argument, *topoi* from outside of the text involving the disposition and actions of the divine, frequently serves as an enthymematic rationale in New Testament literature (cf. Lk 6.36). An example of *topoi* from within the text is the statement of case (of thesis) of the third speech (7.28), which compels the implied reader to draw upon intratextual information from earlier in the narrative (1.5-2.52) in order to complete the rhetorical construction.

Finally, enthymemes appear as key markers in speeches, serving as stylistic mechanisms for capturing pivotal *topoi* for the implied reader. In particular, enthymemes round off argument in a way that the inference cannot be refuted or, if refuted, with the greatest level of difficulty.⁴⁴ An excellent example of the latter is the conclusion to the fourth speech (8.16-18), in that the narrative switches from the largely inductive argument of the introduction (8.5-8a), statement of case (8.8b-10), and body (8.11-15) to deduction. Notwithstanding, enthymemes should not be used in overabundance, as such detracts from the overall effectiveness of the argumentation.⁴⁵ The four speeches largely exhibit rhetorical argument that conforms with this

⁴³Thomas M. Conley, "The Enthymeme in Perspective," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984) 168-87, who argues this point and others regarding the Aristotelean enthymeme.

⁴⁴*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.23.26.

⁴⁵Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.17.6-3.17.8; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 5.14.27-5.14.32.

instruction from the ancient rhetorical handbooks. For example, the introduction to the second speech (6.20-26) consists of a series of enthymemes that builds for optimal impact through repetition, switches to a maxims in the statement of case (6.27-31), moves to a mixture of rhetorical questioning, maxims, and enthymemes in the body (6.32-45), and concludes with inductive examples in the conclusion (6.46-49).

3 SPEECHES IN ANCIENT GRECO-ROMAN NARRATIVE

Speeches in ancient Greco-Roman narrative – ranging from epic, to novels, to historiography, to biography – play a pivotal role in inscribing narrative discourse,⁴⁶ providing the framework from which the implied reader generates plot lines, discerns theme and motifs (*topoi*), and construes characterization. As such, speeches serve as the means through which implied authors communicate information to implied readers, with the derivation being the identification of narrative trajectories and subsequently construction of narrative discourse. In addition, *contra* modern and postmodern narrative, ancient Greco-Roman narrative is not interested in telling *what* happened but explaining *why* and *how* with details regarding *who*. Within this context, speeches typically provide the implied reader with the “ligaments and muscle” needed to ascertain the specific contours of the narrative skeleton, interpretive grids containing information used to bring coherence and consistency to the narrative and, in turn, to make hermeneutical judgments regarding the actions of characters and character groups and ideological systems represented by the narrative discourse.

⁴⁶The amount of research on the role of speeches in ancient Greco-Roman narrative is significant; see, e.g., Peter Toohey, *Reading Epic: An Introduction to the Ancient Narratives* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Virginia J. Hunter, *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

An important framing mechanism, speeches evoke both analeptic and proleptic activity, providing the implied reader with both implicit commentary and explanation on preceding narrative and an interpretive framework for discerning coherence from subsequent narrative. In regard to the latter, speeches often help propel the narrative forward by introducing permutations in plot line(s), adding to or introducing new *topoi*, and laying an “interpretive filter” from which evaluations can be made regarding the actions of characters (whether protagonists, antagonists, or simply minor characters). Just as speeches at the conclusion of a narrative provide important information that guides the implied reader in bringing plot line(s) to completion⁴⁷ or, in some instances, creates dissonance that spurs hermeneutical appropriation,⁴⁸ speeches in the initial stages of narrative – both of protagonists and antagonists – play an integral role in the evaluation of later scenes and actions by the implied reader. While the speeches in Acts have received significant attention as they coincide with these tendencies, the speeches in Luke have garnered little recognition as speeches in their own right and, needless to say, in terms of their rhetorical argument.⁴⁹

⁴⁷Alexander, “Reading Luke-Acts,” 419-46.

⁴⁸Among the more notable examples of narratives that have open endings: Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; Philostratus’ *Life of Apollonius*; and the Gospel of Mark (16.8). Luke-Acts fits this scenario as well, with Paul’s final speech (Acts 28.17-28) providing both closure and suspension (e.g., Brosend, “Means of absent ends,” 348-62; Marguerat, “Silent Closing, 284-304; idem, “End of Acts,” 74-89).

⁴⁹Note the comment of David L. Balch (“ἀκριβῶς ... γράψαι (Luke 1:3): To Write the Full History of God’s Receiving All Nations,” in *Heritage of Israel*, 240: fn41) in regard to the rhetorical examination of Soards (*Speeches in Acts*): “[He] fails to investigate the speeches in the Gospel of Luke or any connection the hymns in the infancy narrative might have to the speeches in Acts, and second, he fails to investigate any relationship to speeches in Greco-Roman historiography beyond formal rhetorical categories.”



4 CONCLUSION

The aforementioned analysis of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric will serve as the foundation for my examination of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry. My investigation begins with the understanding that speeches in ancient Greco-Roman narrative – specifically those placed at the beginning of the narrative – prompt implied readers to demarcate core elements of narrative texture, ranging from plot, to theme, to characterization, to *topoi*. Second, the rhetorical texture – most notably style – helps the implied reader to build overarching narrative coherence. In particular, both deductive (viz., rhetorical questioning, maxims, and enthymemes) and inductive (viz., examples, parables) argumentation guide the implied reader in engendering meaning from the narrative. Finally, as I will detail in chapter ten, rhetorical texture serves an important role in the identification of ideological systems represented by the narrative discourse and moreover different ways in which it confirms, reinterprets, and confronts the ideological location of authorial readers.

PART TWO:
RHETORICAL TEXTURE OF THE FOUR LUKAN GALILEAN SPEECHES

4

FIRST GALILEAN SPEECH (LK 4.14-30): HOMETOWN SYNAGOGUE REJECTS NEW PATRONAL BOUNDARIES

Lk 4.14-30 draws upon the past in the form of Jesus' citation of two LXX examples associated with Elijah and Elisha in order to dictate that a particular stance to be taken in regard to Jesus' *ethos*. Here Jesus draws similarities between those who rejected Elijah and Elisha in the LXX because of their embrace of Gentiles and those who reject him because of his extension of salvation to those outside of the boundaries of kinship and friendship. Through the narrative discourse the implied author establishes an antagonistic character type – initially comprised of Jesus' hometown synagogue crowd – that the implied reader expands to include other characters and character groups as the narrative progresses.

1 RHETORICAL SITUATION

The rhetorical situation for the first speech of the Galilean ministry (4.14-30) is established in vv.14-16, which plays an important role in its sequential processing in that the narrative transition denotes that Jesus returns from the wilderness to initiate his ministry in Nazareth of Galilee. Vv.14-16 includes some key intratextual linkages to the narrative section (1.5-2.52) following the prologue, a self-contained unit,

addressing the birth and childhood of Jesus, which is comprised of three separate stories that move from the discourse of promise to that of praise response. As all three accounts take place in Galilee, the implied reader is led to understand Galilee as a place of spiritual formation and growth. Specifically, the reference that Jesus returned to Galilee (vv. 14-16) prompts the implied reader to construe the rhetorical context of the speech with what has previously taken place in Galilee. This analeptic activity involves the following intratexts. First, in 1.26-38, the Angel Gabriel appears to Mary to announce her miraculous conception (1.26-38). Second, when Jesus and his parents return from Bethlehem to Galilee, the narrator notes that Jesus “grew and became strong, filled with wisdom (σοφία); and the favor (χάρις) of God was upon him” (2.39-40). Third, after Jesus, who was at the age of twelve, travels with his parents to Jerusalem for the feast of Passover, the narrator again notes when Jesus returns to Galilee, repeating some of the wording from the second account (2.39-34), that he “increased in wisdom (σοφία) and in stature, and in favor (χάρις) with God and man” (2.51-52). The geographical space of Galilee, as a result, is a place where the *ethos* of Jesus advances; the implied reader, therefore, expects similar results when approaching the inaugural speech of Jesus in 4.14-30.

In addition to the connotations represented by the geographical change, there are a number of verbal allusions in 4.14-15 to the preceding narrative, which also help to curry favorable expectations on the part of the implied reader. The implied author has already established that those to whom the Spirit (τοῦ πνεύματος) is attributed (v.14) are to be viewed positively, as individuals or character groups endowed with special qualities (John the Baptist in 1.15; Elizabeth in 1.41; Zechariah in 1.67; Mary in 1.35; Simeon in 2.25, 27; and Jesus in 3.22). Further, the narrator’s insertion that

Jesus' attendance in the synagogue was done "according to his custom" (κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ) (v.16) hearkens back to the time when Jesus, at the age of twelve, was lost in the temple and was found by his parents at the feet of the teachers after searching for three days via the earlier intratext κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς ("according to the custom") in 2.42. The implied reader anticipates, because of this intratextual linkage, that the earlier success – that is, the "amazement" that the Jewish teachers displayed at his understanding (2.47) – will continue with the new scene in 4.14-30. Finally, use of the verb ὑποστρέφω (v.14) hearkens back to 4.1, where the narrator also notes that Jesus "returned" (ὑπέστρεψεν) endowed with the Spirit. The implied reader, based on this connection, expects similar results in Jesus' encounter with his hometown synagogue crowd as in his confrontation with Satan in 4.1-15 – a rhetorical (*logos*) triumph. In sum, the rhetorical situation for the first Galilean speech of Jesus is cloaked in repetitive language reminiscent of earlier narrative that predisposes the implied reader to expect the following: (1) divine activity will likely occur; (2) Jesus will continue to advance his *logos* and *ethos*; and (3) the Nazareth synagogue crowd – in a privileged position concerning Jesus' identity – will warmly receive him.

2 RHETORICAL TEXTURE

The is widely accepted as playing a pivotal role in the establishment of plot and characterization, for both Luke and Acts. Few scholars see 4.14-30 as a speech imbued with rhetorical texture, however. Most investigations rather concentrate on underlying source- and redaction-critical issues or the use of the LXX in the narrative scene.¹

¹See, e.g., François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9-50*, trans Christine M. Thomas (Hermenia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002) 148-57.

Albeit without concern for ancient rhetoric, some recent attempts examine the impact of the speech upon the overall narrative discourse of Luke-Acts, with particular attention to matters such as plot and characterization and intratextual connections and patterns.² It is my contention that the construction of narrative trajectories and discourse, as associated with and extending from 4.14-30, is closely tethered to the speech's embodiment of rhetorical texture. A thorough-going understanding of the speech and its relationship to the overall narrative, as a result, is not possible without first looking at its rhetorical argument.

Unlike other speeches in Luke-Acts, the one in Lk 4.16-30 does not come to completion, as the narrative audience endeavors to end Jesus' life (vv.28-30). As such, an audience enmeshed in Greco-Roman rhetoric would immediately recognize the absence of the speech's conclusion, deducing that the audience was so agitated by Jesus' words that they did not even allow him to complete his rhetorical argument.

2.1 Introduction (4.18-20)

The reading from Isaiah demarcates the introduction (vv.18-20), a passage embraced by many of the character groups from the narrative world of Luke-Acts (particularly the bulk of the Galilean populace) as denotative of hope. The narrative aside in v.22 clarifies any confusion on the part of the implied reader; the introduction serves its purpose: Jesus' audience places him in high regard, to the point of marveling

²Two representative examples include Frans Neirynck, "Luke 4,16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts," in *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 357-95; Jeffrey S. Siker, "'First to the Gentiles': A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 73-90.

at his gracious words. The introduction is bracketed by parallel actions – in a chiasmic pattern – prompting the implied reader to identify it as a separate unit.³

- A Jesus stands up to read
- B Jesus takes the book from the attendant
- C Jesus reads from the book
- B' Jesus hands the book back to the attendant
- A' Jesus sits down

The center of the chiastic arrangement falls upon the reading from Isaiah, prompting the implied reader to identify the intertextual LXX citation as the apex of the introduction. Repetition of the pronoun *με* in the emphatic position in the first three lines (v.18ab) and the parallel symmetry of the ensuing three clauses initiated by infinitives largely determine the structure of the introduction (v.18c-19). The initial period – consisting of “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor” – is in the form of an enthymeme. The conjunction *οὐ ἐῖνεκεν* serves as the link between the minor premise, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon Jesus,” and the conclusion, “Jesus has been anointed to preach good news to the poor.” The implied reader fills the major premise, namely, those who preach good news to the poor are filled with the Holy Spirit.

Conclusion: Jesus has been anointed to preach good news to the poor.

Major Premise: Those who preach good news to the poor are filled with the Holy Spirit.

Minor Premise: The Holy Spirit is upon Jesus.

The enthymematic argument provides the implied reader with an interpretive lens: “preaching good news to the poor” denotes that one possesses the Holy Spirit.

³*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.30. For the chiasmic construction of Jesus’ actions, see H. J. B. Combrink, “The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30,” *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973) 27-47; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 209; Nolland, *Luke*, vol. 1, 191-92.

Specific parameters of “preaching good news to the poor” are delineated vis-à-vis the three infinitival clauses in vv.18-19: (1) to proclaim release (ἄφεσιν) to the captives and sight to the blind; (2) to send forth the oppressed in release (ἄφεσιν); and (3) to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor.⁴ The repetition of ἄφεσιν accentuates the intertextual connection with jubiliary themes present in Deutero-Isaiah – particularly chapters 57 and 61 – as well as the social implications of Jubilee legislation in Lev 25 (esp. v.10).⁵ Hence, the implied reader defines ἄφεσιν via these intertextual linkages: release from debts.⁶

2.2 Statement of Case (4.21-22)

The statement of case (or thesis) begins with Jesus telling his audience that the realization of divine benefaction contained in the Isaianic citation (viz., the introduction) is fulfilled with the onset of his ministry (v.21).⁷ Connection between the introduction and statement of case is accentuated by the narrative aside in v.20, which

⁴See, e.g., Roth, *Character Types*, esp. 152-64.

⁵Other Jewish texts exhibit interpretive maneuvering of the jubiliary themes of Isaiah (11QMelchizedek, Ps[s] Sol 11, Dan 9.24-27). For a discussion, see, e.g., Robert Sloan, *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin, Texas: Schola Press, 1977); Sharon Ringe, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee: Images for Ethics and Christology* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).

⁶Note the further intertextual connection with the Year of Jubilee in Lev 25 that is suggested by Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 156: “The connection between the Year of Jubilee and the homeland in the LXX is usually forgotten. During this year of forgiveness (Lev 25:10 LXX) and blessing (Lev 25:21 LXX), all people should return to their homeland: καὶ ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ἀπελεύσθε (‘‘and each should go off to his or her fatherland,’’ Lev 25:10 LXX). Thus it is in accordance with the Scriptures that Jesus begins preaching the year of grace in his hometown.”

⁷Siker (“Literary Analysis,” 77-79) contends 4.21b (“today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing”) stands as the “final climax” of the section, though on the basis of a parallel structure between vv.16-18 and vv.20-21.

heightens narrative suspense and highlights the first part of the statement of case in v.21 for the implied reader.⁸ The use of χάρις to describe the words spoken on behalf of Jesus in the following narrative aside in v.22 hearkens to the two summary statements in 1.40 and 2.52, thereby prodding the implied reader initially to equate those from the synagogue on the same level as the narrator. This perception is transitory, as the revulsion those from the synagogue display at the end of the scene (vv.28-30) quickly deconstructs this image. The implied reader also ascertains – based on previous narrative discourse clearly demarcating Jesus as the “Son of God” and not the “son of Joseph” (cf. 2.48-50; 3.21-23) – that the designation of Jesus as “Joseph’s son” by the synagogue audience is not sufficient.⁹

2.3 Body of Argument (4.23-27)

The main body of the speech – or body of argument – begins with a challenge from Jesus to the synagogue crowd in the form of two aphorisms, with the second (v.24) corroborated by two examples from the prophets. The first aphorism, “Physician, heal yourself,” was a well-known maxim in Greco-Roman as well as Jewish rhetoric. It was employed in an argument to implore that one must deliver the same favors to his or her kin and friends as she or he provides to others beyond the

⁸Per Siker (*ibid.*, 78), ἀτενίζω is used in Lukan narrative asides and functions to slow down narrative time and heighten focus on the subsequent discourse – speech or action (cf. Lk 22.56; Acts 1.10; 3.4, 12; 6.15; 7.55; 10.4; 11.6; 13.6; 14.9).

⁹The narrative aside in 3.23 at the beginning of Jesus’ genealogy (“as some suppose”) is a clear indication to the implied reader that those who identify Jesus as the “son of Joseph” are wrong. Wasserberg sees an analeptic connection with 2.35 and the prediction contained therein: “Offenbar geworden ist jetzt erstmals in Anlehnung an die Worte Simeons in Lk 2,35b, welcher Herzen Gedanken die Einwohner Nazarets über den Heilssohn aus ihrer Mitte wirklich hegen.” (*Aus Israels*, 160)

boundaries of kinship and friendship.¹⁰ The implied reader, drawing on this extratextual repertoire, concludes that Jesus will not deliver the parochial blessings his hometown synagogue crowd anticipates. In the case of the second aphorism, the identity of the “rejected prophet” (v.24) is given an ironic twist in the narrative discourse: the reaction of the synagogue crowd in vv.28-29 – in their rejection of Jesus – prompts the implied reader to identify Jesus as the “rejected prophet.” As a result, Jesus’ opponents – rather than diminishing – actually strengthen the *ethos* of his characterization.

Reference to the deeds Jesus performed in Capernaum in the first aphorism (v.23) creates a dissonance for the implied reader, as there is no previous reference to this activity in the narrative. Rather, in order for the implied reader to make sense of the text, the ensuing section in 4.31-42 regarding the deeds Jesus performed in Capernaum must be read analeptically. It is a gap in the narrative discourse that cannot be filled until the processing of the subsequent narrative.

The second of the two aphorisms (v.24) is corroborated in the latter part of the body of argument with two examples from the prophets (inductive argument using examples), one of Elijah from 1 Kgs 17.8-24 and the other of Elisha from 2 Kgs 5.1-19. The second aphorism includes several intratextual linkages that serve as an analeptic and proleptic pointer for the implied reader. Specifically, the use of δεκτός, προφήτη, and ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ in the aphorism prompts the implied reader to connect “the acceptable (δεκτός) year of the Lord” from the introduction (v.19) with the prophetic ministries of Elisha and Elijah via the two LXX examples in vv.25-27;

¹⁰See John Nolland, “Classical Rabbinic Parallels to ‘Physician, Heal Yourself’ (Luke iv 23),” *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979) 193-209; S.J. Noorda, “‘Cure Yourself, Doctor!’ (Luke 4,23): Classical Parallels to an Alleged Saying of Jesus,” in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus. Méorial Joseph Coppens*, ed. Joël Delobel (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 59; Leuven: Leuven University, 1982) 459-69.

this includes extension of πατρίς beyond Nazareth (insiders) to the Gentles (outsiders).¹¹

Parallelism is a device frequently employed in Greco-Roman rhetoric. The structure of the two LXX examples in the latter part of the body of argument (vv.25-27) stand in parallel fashion:

- A there were many widows in Israel
- B in the time of Elijah
- C yet Elijah was sent to none of them
- D except to a widow at Zarephath in Sidon.
- A' there were also many lepers in Israel
- B' in the time of the prophet Elisha
- C' and none of them were cleansed
- D' except Naaman the Syrian.¹²

This four-fold parallelism accentuates both the needs of those in Israel and the exceptional character of the recipients of divine blessing – namely, the widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian, those outside of the community, the socially and religiously disenfranchised. Elijah is sent to a woman, a non-Jew, a widow. Elisha is also sent to a non-Jew, a despised Syrian whose disease distanced himself from the community of those belonging to God. The implied reader, therefore, concludes that the “good news to the poor” comes to lowly personages like the widow and unclean such as the Gentile – namely, those of marginal status.

¹¹See Siker, “Literary Analysis,” 82-83, for this observation. Also, Wasserberg who pinpoints connections between v.24 and the LXX examples of Elisha and Elijah in vv.25-27: “Kein Prophet ist wohlgekommen in seiner Heimatstadt (Lk 4,24), ergo kann auch der Prophet Jesus in Nazaret nur auf Ablehnung stoßen. Daß diese Regel vom Geschick der Propheten sogar schriftgemäß ist, zeigt er mit seinem Verweis auf Elia und Elisa” (*Aus Israels*, 163).

¹²See Larrimore C. Crockett, “Luke 4:25-27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969) 177-83, for this four-fold parallelism.

2.4 Missing Conclusion (4.28-30)

Jesus does not have an opportunity to complete the speech due to the violent response of the synagogue crowd. The narrator does not specify the reasons behind their reaction; rather, the implied reader must fill this narrative gap. The legislation in Deut 13.1-11 – where the Israelite community is instructed to stone those who make false prophetic claims – is one possible intertext upon which the implied reader draws in understanding the actions of the synagogue crowd.¹³ This intertextual connection is one element, however, as the abrupt interruption to Jesus' speech supplies the bulk of the information. The narrative crowd responds positively to the introduction of the speech. Only after hearing the statement of case and body of argument does the narrative audience display an adverse reaction. The statement of case details to the synagogue crowd that Jesus – *contra* their self-centered expectations vis-à-vis actualization of the initial aphorism in v.23 by the implied reader – will not bestow the same blessings to them as he did to those in Capernaum.

3 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

Despite an almost overwhelming amount of scholarly research on the first speech of the Galilean ministry, little exists in terms of demarcating its rhetorical texture. My above analysis attempts to push the discussion further by accounting for the speech in terms of rhetorical argument – specifically in the purview of Greco-Roman rhetorical style. When the speech is construed from this lens, new vistas of

¹³For this intertextual suggestion, see Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 218. Also, cf. 2 Chr 25.12 (parallel to Lk 4.29), per Bovon (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 156: fn41), where “the people of Judah captured another ten thousand alive, took them to the top of a rock and threw them down (κατεκρήμνιζον – κατακρημνίσαι in Lk 4.29) from the top of the rock, so that all of them were dashed to pieces.”

meaning result through the construction of rhetorical texture by the implied reader – ranging from the presence of rhetorical devices such as chiasm and parallelism, to a speech that does not end (due to the violent reaction of the narrative audience), to inductive argument in the form of two examples from the LXX. As part of the larger rhetorical argument of the speech, all of these parts fit together to form a coherent whole. I will move the discussion beyond formalistic analysis to readerly concerns in chapter nine – ways in which the rhetorical texture engenders narrative trajectories in the form of plot, characterization, and *topoi* – and ideological concerns in chapter ten – ways in which the narrative trajectories confirm, reinterpret, and confront the ideological locations of authorial readers.

5

SECOND GALILEAN SPEECH (LK 6.17-49): A NEW ETHICAL MODE OF (NON-RECIPROCAL) BENEFACTION

The second speech is the most detailed of the four speeches contained in the Galilean ministry. Like the first speech in 4.14-30, the second speech follows one of several narrative episodes (6.12-16) – scattered throughout this section of the Gospel – where Jesus withdraws from the crowds. The narrative scenes between the first and second speeches largely portray confrontations between Jesus and Jewish interlocutors – those with social, ethnic, and religious boundaries threatened by Jesus’ actions and words. Figurative connotations of the selection of twelve disciples prompt the implied reader to tether apocalyptic meaning to the episode – an intertextual derivation suggesting that the restoration of Israel would coincide with the reconstitution of the twelve tribes.¹

¹This trajectory is evident in the narrative discourse such as Lk 22.30 and the episode in Acts 1.12-26. The extratextual repertoire of the narrative audience and the implied reader is comprised of various intertexts portending the connection between the “restoration of Israel” and the “reconstitution of the twelve tribes” (see, e.g., Jacob Jervell, “The Twelve on Israel’s Thrones: Luke’s Understanding of the Apostolate,” in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1972] 75-112).

1 RHETORICAL SITUATION

The rhetorical situation for the second speech is established in 6.17-19, where Jesus comes down from the mountain to address the disciples who have been traveling with him. The disciples are not confined simply to the twelve apostles Jesus appointed in 6.12-16, but rather to all those who embrace the message of salvation – a larger group of disciples as well as a multitude of people seeking to hear his message and to receive healing for diseases. This scene is reminiscent of that when Moses descended from Mount Sinai to deliver the ten commandments to the Jewish people (Exod 19.24, 24.3), leading the implied reader to recognize the similarities and thus impose comparable expectations on that which is about to take place in the Lukan narrative. The implied reader construes subsequent narrative discourse of Luke-Acts through this lens; the speech in 6.20-49 serves as the basis of Jesus' teaching, just as the law served as the basis for Moses and his predecessors.²

The scene in 6.17-19 mirrors the buttressed scenes in 4.42-44 and 5.1-11, where Jesus – after emerging from seclusion – encounters burgeoning crowds seeking to hear his message and to receive healing from him. In 5.1-11, the implied author employs a type scene,³ whereby the calling of the three disciples echoes the

²See, e.g., Luke T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina, 3; Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1991) 110-11, who posits a connection between 6.17-19 and Moses' descent from Mount Sinai with the law. Richard A. Horsley, "The Covenant Renewal Discourse: Q 6:20-49," in *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*, ed. Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan A. Draper (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999) 195-227, argues that Q 6.20-49 stands as a coherent speech in Q and functions as a covenantal renewal discourse as reflected in Deut 28, Exod 21-23, Lev 19, and Deut 22.

³Recognition of type scenes as a rhetorical device in biblical literature is based on the work of Robert Alter ("Annunciation Type-Scene," 115-30; idem, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 47-62). The background to a type scene can be based on either intertextual or intratextual referents.

“commission story” in Isa 6.1-10.⁴ This information, coupled with the preceding appointment of the twelve apostles, prods the implied reader to anticipate similar results: Jesus will continue to expand his coterie of followers. The growth of Jesus’ ministry is encapsulated in the notation by the narrator that the great crowd of disciples and multitude of people came from all of Judea and Jerusalem as well as the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon. The magnitude of the crowd is accentuated by the repetition of the adjective πολὺς and use of ὄχλοι and πλῆθος (“a great crowd of his disciples and great multitude of people”) in v.17b. The region also has expanded beyond Galilee to that of all Judea; the regional center is no longer Capernaum but Jerusalem (v.17c). Further, the inclusion of Tyre and Sidon (v.17c) hints at the presence of Gentiles – vis-à-vis an analeptic connection with the Sidonian widow from the initial speech (4.26-27). A *topos* that continues throughout the Lukan corpus, was integral in the initial speech of 4.14-30 (particularly the citation of Isa 61.1 and 58.6 in 4.18-20), and was a constant in the narrative scenes between the first and second speeches (viz., Peter’s mother-in-law in 4.38-39; the multitudes at Capernaum in 4.40-41; the paralytic in 5.17-26; the man with the withered hand in 6.6-11), that of healing people from their diseases, ties the speech to the preceding narrative.⁵ The final part of the period in vv.17-19 (v.19) specifies that the crowd was seeking to touch Jesus because δύναμις came forth from him. Analeptic activity by the implied reader results in the connection of this scene with the transition (4.14-15) preceding Jesus’ first speech in the Galilean ministry (“And Jesus returned in the “power” [δυνάμει] of the Spirit into Galilee” –

⁴See Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 60-61.

⁵See, e.g., Ben Witherington III, “Salvation and Health,” 145-65; John J. Pilch, “Sickness and Healing in Luke-Acts,” in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 181-209.

v.14a) ; specifically, the implied reader understands that Jesus' healing activity in 6.19 – resulting from his possession of δύναμις – is a derivative of his endowment of the Holy Spirit. The precise reasons for the crowd seeking to touch Jesus are not noted by the narrator, a gap that the implied reader must fill. Is it because of the healing he is dispensing or because of the fact that he is full of the Spirit? Eventually, a retrospective reading of characterization in Luke-Acts leads the implied reader to the realization that characters who truly embrace discipleship come to Jesus because of the latter (viz., they are full of the Holy Spirit).

2 RHETORICAL ARGUMENT

Surprisingly, few interpreters of 6.20-49 consider it from the standpoint of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric, and most see little coherence in the whole as well as between the different parts.⁶ The few who do query it for the embodiment of ancient rhetoric largely do so vis-à-vis redactional comparison, using the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5.1-7.29) as the basis of their analysis.⁷ Kennedy's assessment is representative: "Luke 6 is not a very good speech. What persuasive power Luke's speech has inheres almost solely in the *ethos*, or authority, of Jesus. In Matthew too *ethos* is primary, but more attempt is made to couch statements in logical form, and

⁶Jonathan Knight's comments are representative (*Luke's Gospel*, 91-92): "There follows in 6.37-49 a collection of sayings with no obvious connection between them. . . . the form of the material even suggests that it *depends* for its meaning on the provision of subsequent commentary. It is compressed and does not read easily when compared to Luke's pacier narrative." Knight's assessment is flawed in that he shows no regard to the predication of the Lukan narrative discourse on Greco-Roman rhetoric and moreover ignores its oral/aural nature. In contrast to Knight and others, see Horsley, "Covenant Renewal," 209-16, who argues that the speech is a coherent whole that is demarcated by oral/aural patterns.

⁷Note Bovon's comment (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 215): "In both scholarship and the church, the Matthean Sermon on the Mount has crowded out the Lukan Sermon on the Plain, which must be heard in its own guise."

greater *pathos* is achieved.”⁸ While redactional analysis is helpful in identifying various indicators regarding the implied author, it is inadequate for explaining how rhetorical argument functions within a narrative’s discourse – such as plot, characterization, and *topoi*. In addition, *contra* Kennedy’s claim that Lk 6.20-49 lacks the overarching argumentation of Matt 5.1-7.29 – focusing on the argumentative mode of *ethos* and largely ignoring the other two – I suggest a more attentive reading yields a dialectical texture that encompasses all three modes of argumentation: *ethos* and *logos* and, to a lesser extent, *pathos*.

The rhetorical situation – represented in 6.17-19 – situates the scene in a very positive light, providing the implied reader with further corroboration for Jesus’ contention in the first speech regarding the fulfillment of Isa 61.1-2 and 58.6 (Lk 4.21). In doing so, the implied author bolsters the *ethos* of Jesus by demonstrating the authenticity of his words. Jesus’ interlocutors, whom he has encountered at almost every turn since escaping from the angry synagogue crowd in his hometown of Nazareth (4.30), are not mentioned by the narrator as present. As a result, it seems, since Jesus is able to complete the speech without interruption (*contra* his first speech in 4.16-30), that his interlocutors are not in attendance.⁹ The exact composition of the character group of “disciples” is open ended at this point in the narrative; the implied reader infers a connection between those following Jesus and discipleship based on the preceding narrative (e.g., 5.1-11; 5.27-32).

⁸*Through Rhetorical Criticism*, 67.

⁹The one flaw in this argumentation is that the scenes where Jesus is confronted by his opponents are not structured as speeches but rather in terms of confrontational dialogue. These more closely correspond to chreia (see, e.g., Vernon K. Robbins, “The Chreia,” in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988] 1-23).

3 RHETORICAL TEXTURE

Various proposals on the structural dimensions of the speech exist.¹⁰ Those who view the speech through the lens of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric largely concur that vv.20-26 forms the *exordium* and vv.46-49 resembles a *conclusio*.¹¹ The binary argument of the two parts stands in parallel: blessings and woes in the *exordium* and two contrasting paradigmatic examples in the *conclusio*. The rhetorical arrangement of the body of the speech (vv.27-45) is where the uncertainty arises; scholars designate the material as paraenetic in nature and do not place the material within the specific context of ancient rhetorical arrangement.

As I discussed in chapter three, the speeches in the Gospels and Acts – for the most part – do not conform with the rhetorical invention and arrangement delineated in the rhetorical handbooks. Recognition of a *species* and structure that coheres with that specified in the handbooks is unlikely – both in terms of a writer fully trained in handbook rhetoric and an audience atune to listen to the speeches as representations of

¹⁰Most proposals reflect form-critical concerns (e.g., Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 216). However, though not from the basis of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric, cf. Horsley, “Covenant Renewal,” 195-227, who envisions a five-fold structure reflecting covenantal renewal discourses evinced in LXX (Lev 19, Exod 19 and 24) and Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 3.13-4.26): vv.20-26, vv.27-36, vv.37-42, vv.43-45, and vv.46-49.

¹¹See, e.g., Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 571-640, who proposes a three-fold structure using ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical categories: *exordium* in vv.20-26; paraenetic body in vv.27-45 (consisting of conduct of disciples to outsiders in vv.27-38; rules concerning conduct within the community in vv.39-42; conduct towards oneself in vv.43-45); and *conclusio* in vv.46-49. Also cf. Jacques Dupont, *Les béatitudes: Le problème littéraire: Les deux versions du Sermon sur la Montagne et des Béatitudes*, vol. 1, 2d (Bruges and Louvain: Abbaye de Saint-Abbrè/E. Nauwelaerts, 1958) 200, who suggests a four-fold structure consisting of the *exordium* in vv.20-26, body in vv.27-42 (two parts: vv.27-36 and vv.37-42), and *conclusio* in vv.43-49.

handbook rhetoric (viz., for the law court or public assembly). While the speech exhibits rhetorical argument that has a coherent structure and style, it is a far reach to claim conformity with the rhetorical invention and arrangement found in the rhetorical handbooks. The rhetorical texture, in my opinion, breaks into four basic units.

Carefully crafted blessings and woes in vv.20-26 form the introduction. The implied author establishes the statement of case or purpose of the speech in vv.27-31. The body of argument in vv.32-45 is replete with deductive and inductive reasoning, which is supported with several analogies. The speech concludes with a longer, more detailed analogy in vv.46-49.

3.1 Introduction (6.20-26)

The introduction (6.20-26) exhibits a balanced four-fold parallelism that contrasts blessings (vv.20-23) and woes (vv.24-26), a common mode of argumentation in the LXX and other Jewish texts.¹² The *ethos* of Jesus is corroborated by the *logos* of the rhetorical construction,¹³ thus prompting the implied reader to construct a positive image of Jesus as a reliable, skilled orator.¹⁴

¹²Isa 3.10-11; 1 Enoch 96.1-8; 97.1-10; Eccl 10.16-17; Tob 13.12; 2 Bar 10.6-7.

¹³Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, 1.2.4) contends that the *ethos* of a speaker is internal to the speech, part of the *logos*, and does not derive from outside of the speech itself.

¹⁴For an excellent discussion of *ethos* in Lk 6.20-49, though from the standpoint of Q and not Luke-Acts, see Shawn Carruth, "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20-49," in *Conflict and Invention*, 98-115. The introduction of a speech in antiquity is pivotal in establishing the *ethos* of the speaker Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 3.8.36; Cicero, *De Oratore*, 2.42.182; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.2.3; *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 15; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 4.1.7; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.14.12.

A Blessed are the poor,
for yours is the kingdom of God.
B Blessed are the hungry now,
for you shall be satisfied.
C Blessed are you that weep now,
for you shall laugh.
D Blessed are you when men hate you
and when they exclude you
and they cast out your name as evil on account of the Son
of Man.
Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy,
for behold, your reward is great in heaven;
for so their fathers did to the prophets.

A' But woe to the rich,
for you have received your consolation.
B' Woe to you, the ones who are full now,
for you shall hunger.
C' Woe to you that laugh now,
for you shall mourn and weep.
D' Woe to you, when all men speak well of you,
for so their fathers did to the false prophets.¹⁵

The anaphoric positioning of μακάριος and οὐαί connects as well as reenforces the impact of the successive series of blessings and then woes, with the conjunctive πλήν serving as the transition between the two. Grammatical comparison of the blessings and woes shows that the latter come across as more direct: the second-person address (ὁμῖν in v.24 and v.25 and ὑμᾶς in v.26) in the first three woes has no corresponding parallel in the first three blessings (vv.20b-21).¹⁶ The direct address in woe parallels – versus the blessing parallels – prompts the narrative audience and implied reader to place the rhetorical emphasis on them. The presence of a corresponding direct address

¹⁵See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 265-68, for this parallel construction.

¹⁶For this observation, see Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 572.

in the fourth blessing/woe cluster (vv.22-23 and v.26) serves as a rhetorical marker for the narrative audience and implied reader; the result being that the fourth blessing and woe cluster receives greater primacy in the overall rhetorical argument. Each of the blessings and woes are in the form of an enthymeme, which I will discuss in the following sections.

3.1.1 First Three Pair of Blessing/Woe Clusters

The first three pair of blessing and woe clusters in the introduction begin with a conclusion followed by the minor premise; the implied author expects the implied reader to deduce the major premise for each. Such “gap filling” shapes the actualization of the narrative discourse and serves as a means for prompting authorial readers to reinterpret ideological beliefs. The enthymematic argument of the three blessing and woe clusters resembles the following:¹⁷

First Blessing/ Woe Cluster: The Poor Versus the Rich (vv.20, 24)

<i>Major Premise:</i> Those who possess the kingdom of God are blessed.	<i>Major Premise:</i> Those who have received consolidation are cursed.
<i>Minor Premise:</i> The poor possess the kingdom of God.	<i>Minor Premise:</i> The rich have received consolation.
<i>Conclusion:</i> Blessed are the poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.	<i>Conclusion:</i> Woe to you who are rich, for you have received your consolation.

Second Blessing/ Woe Cluster: The Hungry Versus the Full (vv.21, 25)

<i>Major Premise:</i> Those who are satisfied are blessed.	<i>Major Premise:</i> Those who are hungry are cursed.
<i>Minor Premise:</i> The hungry shall be satisfied.	<i>Minor Premise:</i> The full shall be hungry.

¹⁷For a different construction of the enthymematic argument, cf. Vernon K. Robbins, “Pragmatic Relations as a Criterion for Authentic Sayings,” *Forum* 1 (1985) 51.

Conclusion: Blessed are you that hunger now, for you shall be satisfied.

Conclusion: Woe to you who are full now, for you shall hunger.

Third Blessing/Woe Cluster: The Disconsolate Versus the Joyful (vv. 21, 25)

Major Premise: Those who laugh are blessed.

Major Premise: Those who mourn and weep are cursed.

Minor Premise: The ones mourning shall laugh.

Minor Premise: The ones laughing shall mourn and weep.

Conclusion: Blessed are you who weep now, for you shall laugh.

Conclusion: Woe to you who laugh now, for you shall mourn and weep.

The major premises of the three blessing and woe clusters are accepted by the narrative audience and implied reader; embedded within generally accepted cultural suppositions. The minor premises and most certainly the conclusions counter underpinning belief systems (viz., honor and shame constructs) of the Greco-Roman world.¹⁸ The reversal of fortunes is an ongoing Lukan *topos* – beginning with the Song of Mary (Lk 1.46-55) and then reoccurring, for example, in the first speech (Lk 4.16-30), Jesus’ instructions on table fellowship (Lk 14.7-24), the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk 16.19-31), the story of the Pharisee and the toll collector (Lk 18.9-14), and the crucifixion and exaltation of Jesus (Lk 22-24).¹⁹ This *topos* comes to fruition in Acts; fortunes of those pushed to the margins are reversed – for example, the communal sharing of the Jerusalem community (Acts 2.43-47; 4.32-37; 5.1-11), the

¹⁸Though his investigation is not from the standpoint of ancient Greco-Roman argument, see Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 265-66, for an overview of the cultural presuppositions that stand behind the blessing and woe clusters. Also, Robbins, “Pragmatic Relations,” 42; Carruth, “Strategies of Authority,” 108.

¹⁹Green, “Social Status of Mary,” 457-72; John O. York, *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 46; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

healing of those afflicted with diseases and unclean spirits (Acts 3.1-10; 5.16; 14.8-18; 16.16-40; 19.11-20), and inclusion of those from the ethnic, religious, and social margins (Acts 8.8-40; 10.1-11.18; 13.4-12; 16.11-15).

3.1.2 Final Blessing/Woe Cluster

The final blessing and woe cluster is different from the preceding three on several accounts. First, the blessing is much more elaborate than the corresponding woe. Second, the blessing actually contains two enthymemes, with one embedded in the other – a rhetorical mode known as intercalation. In this case, the embedded enthymeme bolsters the argument of the one in which it is contained, providing the impetus for the enveloping enthymeme. Third, the subject matter directly pertains to the confrontations Jesus and his disciples encountered earlier in the episodes between the first speech (4.14-30) and the second speech (6.17-49): the authority to forgive sins (5.17-26), the ability to fellowship with tax collectors and sinner (5.27-32), the prerogative to pluck and eat grain on the Sabbath (6.1-5), and the authority to heal on the Sabbath (6.6-11). The two enthymemes comprising the final blessing and woe cluster resemble the following:

Final Blessing/Woe Cluster: The Humble Versus the Proud (vv.22-23, 26)

Major Premise: The prophets are blessed.

Minor Premise: Those whom men hate, exclude, and revile are like the prophets.

Conclusion: Blessed are you when men hate you, and when they exclude and revile you, for so their fathers did to the prophets.

Major Premise: The false prophets are cursed.

Minor Premise: Those of whom men speak well are like the false prophets.

Conclusion: Woe to you, when men speak well of you, for so their fathers did to the false prophets.

Intercalated Descriptive Enthymeme (v.23)

Major Premise: The reward in heaven is cause for rejoicing and leaping for joy.

Minor Premise: The recipients of hate and those who are excluded and reviled have a great reward in heaven.

Conclusion: Rejoice and leap for joy when you are the recipients of hate, excluded, and reviled, for your reward is great in heaven.

3.1.3 Enthymemic Argument Generates Rhetorical Texture

Symmetry between the four woes and preceding four blessings embodies a carefully crafted rhetorical construction; the subject matter, form, and language of the four blessings mirrors that of the four woes. Some of the most notable general corollaries include: (1) anaphoric use of μακάριος and οὐαί; (2) use of the present tense for the minor premise contained in the first and final blessing and woe pairs;²⁰ (3) use of the future tense for the minor premises contained in the second and third blessing and woe pairs; (4) repetition of “now” (νῦν) at the end of the second and third clustered pairs of blessings and woes;²¹ (5) repetition of the temporal conjunction, ὅταν (when), in the final blessing and woe pair; and (6) repetition of the language contained in the minor premises of the final blessing and woe pair. The implied author employs opposites, a rhetorical device frequently used in Greco-Roman oratory,²² to

²⁰Present tense, indicative of gnomic material (see Carruth, “Strategies of Authority, 110-11), serves to make the discourse more vivid and closer to actuality (Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 25.1).

²¹The repetition of the same word at the end of clauses is designated as antistrophe (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.13.19).

²²*Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, 4.17, 4.59-61; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.19.1.

demarcate linkage between each of the four blessing and woe clusters. The four blessing and woe clusters break into the following taxonomies:

First Blessing/Woe Pair: The Poor Versus the Rich (vv.20, 24)

Blessed are you <u>poor</u> (πτωχοί), for yours is the kingdom of God.	Woe to you who are <u>rich</u> (πλουσίοις), for you have received your consolation.
--	---

Second Blessing/Woe Pair: The Hungry Versus the Full (vv.21, 25)

Blessed are you that <u>hunger</u> (πεινῶντες) <u>now</u> (νῦν), for you shall be satisfied.	Woe to you who are full <u>now</u> (νῦν), for you shall <u>hunger</u> (πεινάσετε).
--	--

Third Blessing/Woe Pair: The Disconsolate Versus the Joyful (vv.21, 25)

Blessed are you who <u>weep</u> (κλαίοντες) <u>now</u> (νῦν), for you shall <u>laugh</u> (γελάσετε).	Woe to you who <u>laugh</u> (γελῶντες) <u>now</u> (νῦν), for you shall mourn and <u>weep</u> (κλαύσετε).
--	--

Final Blessing/Woe Pair: The Humble Versus the Proud (vv.22-23, 26)

Blessed are you who <u>weep</u> (κλαίοντες) <u>now</u> (νῦν), for you shall <u>laugh</u> (γελάσετε).	Woe to you who <u>laugh</u> (γελῶντες) <u>now</u> (νῦν), for you shall mourn and <u>weep</u> (κλαύσετε).
--	--

The one deviation in symmetry occurs in the fourth blessing and woe pair, where the conclusion of the blessing contains more detail than that of the woe. In particular, the intercalation of the two enthymemes in the blessing is an additional distinguishing factor. This differentiation guides the implied reader to the realization that the final blessing has particular importance, namely, in terms of the overall narrative discourse – disposition and actions representative of the divine run counter to

cultural norms and incur social and religious rejection as corroborated by an LXX intertextual repertoire (Jer 5.12-13; 6.13-15; Mic 2.11; Ezek 2.1-7).²³

Authenticity of Lk 6.20-26 is disputed, though most acknowledge a common core lies behind Matt 5.3-12 and Lk 6.20-26. It is also widely accepted that the blessings, at least some type of derivation, come from Q. As to the authenticity of the woes in a pre-Lukan source, disagreement exists as to the primacy of Matthew or Luke, though over the past two decades a majority attribute the reading in Luke as secondary. They conclude that the implied author of Luke (1) changed the third-person pronouns of the blessings to the second person; (2) inserted the ensuing woes;²⁴ and (3) added the conjunctive *vûv* to the second and third blessings.²⁵

While resolution of all redaction-critical issues is outside of the purview of my investigation, I propose that redactional comparison shows that the speech is more than simply an *ad hoc* adaptation of a pre-Lukan source by the implied author. To begin, the use of the second person in the Lukan blessings and woes, *contra* the third person found in the blessings of Matthew, is ambiguous – evoking the various

²³The importance of the final blessing is further accentuated by the use of *homoioteleuton* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.20.28), whereby the three verbs used to describe the actions against faithful disciples end with similar sound (viz., the third person plural [-*ωσιν*]).

²⁴However cf. Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, vol. 1, 3d (Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 3; Freiburg: Herder, 1984) 339-41; Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 575.

²⁵The modern derivation of the argument for a secondary reading in Luke goes back to Dupont, *Les Béatitudes*, 297-312; also, cf. Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 222-23. Dupont's argument is corroborated largely by those focusing their studies on Q (e.g., John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Critical Notes and Concordance* [Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1988] 24-27; James M. Robinson, "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12-14 July, 22 November 1991," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 [1992] 501-02; Milton C. Moreland and James M. Robinson, "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 23-27, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 [1995] 478).

character groups plausibly present as well as the implied reader to equate the second person “you” with themselves. The overarching theme of discipleship and the call to such recurs throughout the Lukan corpus;²⁶ the use of the second person forces the narrative audience and implied reader, unlike the use of the indirect third-person addressee by the implied author of Matthew, to directly engage the enthymematic discourse of Lk 6.20-26.

Second, the blessings in Matthew exhibit a mode of general proposition, whereas the blessing and woe clusters in Luke coincide more closely with the blessings and curses of Deut 28 as well as the condemnatory speech of the prophets and select intertextual texts (e.g., Hab 2.6-20; 1 Enoch 96.1-8; 97.1-10; Eccl 10.16-17; Tob 13.12; 2 Bar 10.6-7).²⁷ In particular, the inclusion of a reference to the prophets and false prophets in the final blessing and woe cluster evokes images of the LXX on the part of the implied reader (Neh 9.26; Ezek 2.1-7; Jer 5.12-13; 6.13-15; Mic 2.11) – furthering the association of Jesus’ ministry and message with that of the prophets.²⁸

Third, the blessings in Matthew tend toward the spiritual attitude of the individual. The blessing and woe clusters in Lk 6.20-26, on the other hand, are more

²⁶Lk 3.7-14; 5.1-11; 5.27-32; 6.45-49; 9.57-62; 12.1-59; 14.25-35; 19.11-27; 24.13-49; Acts 3.11-26; 4.8-12; 7.2-53; 8.14-24; 13.13-52; 17.22-31; 20.17-35; 28.17-28. See Green, *Theology of the Gospel*, 102-21, for an overview of the *topos* of discipleship.

²⁷However cf. Horsley (“Covenant Renewal,” 195-227) who contends that the parallels between Lk 6.20-49 and LXX covenantal language such as that in Deut 28, Lev 19, and other texts go back to the earlier Q version of the speech; the inaugural speech in Q is the derivation of an oral covenantal renewal performance for village-based Christian communities in pre-70 CE Galilee.

²⁸Specifically, cf. Gerhard Lofink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas* (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 26; Munich: Kösel, 1971); Thomas L. Brodie, “Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative,” in *New Views on Luke and Acts*, ed. Earl Richard (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1990) 78-85.

oriented towards outward acts of social responsibility required of those who embrace the call to discipleship.²⁹ This falls in line with the overarching Lukan plot line of God dispensing salvation through the ministry of Jesus and through those who are his disciples.³⁰

Finally, bipolarity of the blessing and woe clusters is not foreign to Luke-Acts; rather, the implied author shows a predilection for composing opposites in pairs. Indeed, the use of opposites is an often-used Greco-Roman rhetorical device; giving amplification to the argument, in terms of characterization and *topoi*.³¹ Evidence in the introduction includes the extratextual connotations of μακάριοι and οὐαί as embedded within the cultural bipolar distinctions for honor and shame.³² In this context the narrative audience and the implied reader associate honor with those who part with possessions and wealth for the benefaction of others, at the risk of bringing shame on themselves via their reckless allocation (cf. 6.20-23), and shame with those who fail to impart wealth and possessions for the fear of incurring shame on themselves (cf. 6.24-

²⁹Redaction critics (see, e.g., Paul S. Minear, “Jesus’ Audiences, According to Luke,” *Novum Testamentum* 16 [1974] 81-109) see a change in audience between the introduction (vv.20-26) and the remainder of the speech (vv.27-49) – with insiders as the audience for vv.20-26 and outsiders for vv.27-49. Such ignores the rhetorical nuances of the speech; these function as rhetorical markers – *contra* rhetorical seams demarcating changes in audience – and prompt the narrative audience and implied reader to engender narrative meaning.

³⁰For a thorough-going overview of “salvation to the ends of the earth” as the overarching plot line (or theme as he describes it) of Luke-Acts, see Green, *Theology of the Gospel*. Also cf. his “Salvation to the End of the Earth, 83-106.

³¹Use of bipolarity encompasses Lukan characterization as well – with those who repudiate or fail to embrace Jesus message and ministry juxtaposed to those who adhere to his message and ministry (and, to take it a step further, the message and ministry of disciples) – including *topoi* such as “true” friendship, appropriate use of wealth, the practice of prayer, repentance (or conversion), among others. See the extended discussion of this aspect of the narrative discourse in chapters nine and ten.

³²See K.C. Hanson, “How Honorable! How Shameful! A Cultural Analysis of Matthew’s Makarisms and Reproaches,” *Semeia* 68 (1996): 83-114.

26).³³ This deductive paradigm forms an ironic argument for the narrative audience and the implied reader in that the person seeking honor – based on conventional modes of honor and shame associated with the use of wealth and possessions – incurs shame (at least from the standpoint of Jesus’ rhetorical argument), whereas the person who is the recipient of shame – based on honor and shame cultural frameworks – is placed within the construct of honor. The narrative discourse, therefore, runs counter to cultural constructs of honor and shame and the use of wealth and possessions.

3.2 Statement of Case (6.27-31)

The conjunctive transition ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω in 6.27 demarcates the conclusion from the next section, which specifies the statement of case of the speech (vv.27-31), with the inclusion of τοῖς ἀκούουσιν (“the ones listening”) functioning as a rhetorical device.³⁴ Those “listening” include both characters and character groups who associate themselves as “disciples” within the Lukan narrative world as well as the implied

³³Cf. Jerome H. Neyrey (“Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honour: The cultural context of the original makarisms in Q,” in *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context*, ed. Philip F. Esler [London and New York: Routledge, 1996] 139-58), who makes the argument that those who fail to use wealth and possessions in a strategic manner to accrue “honor” on their families actually incur “shame” on themselves and their families. In the case of the latter, the “shame” brought upon the family brings about an estrangement between the individual and her or his family. Also, see George W.E. Nickelsburg, “Riches, the Rich, and God’s Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke,” *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978/79) 324-44, who pinpoints the *topos* of apocalyptic judgment of the rich and poor from 1 Enoch behind Luke.

³⁴*Contra* redaction-critical approaches that view the notation τοῖς ἀκούουσιν in v.27a as a change in audience, envisioning a redactional seam between vv.20-26 and vv.27-49 (see, e.g., Minear, “Jesus’ Audiences,” 81-109; Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 574-75; Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 216-17). Also, the comments of Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 26: “Change of person gives an equally powerful effect, and often makes the audience feel themselves set in the thick of the danger.”

reader.³⁵ The discourse of the speech ties “listening” to “doing,” both are inseparable. The implied reader, as a result, concludes that only those who “act” (ποιέω) qualify as real listeners. In addition, by means of the ensuing maxims and enthymemes in the statement of case and body of argument, the implied reader ascertains that the action expected on the part of a disciple is a new mode of social responsibility involving non-reciprocal benefaction.

Comprised of a series of maxims, the statement of case communicates the purpose of the speech. The anaphoric composition and presence of other rhetorical features in the introduction disappear from use in the statement of case. Though the speech in its entirety clearly qualifies as disjointed in style, the consecutive use of maxims – one on top of the other – accentuates the rhetorical impact of the statement of case.³⁶

The maxims in the statement of case are general statements and concern material already familiar – and pleasing – to the narrative audience and implied reader. In particular, the inclusion of maxims in the statement of case imbues it with an ethical

³⁵As I touched upon in chapter two, there are different vistas from which to view narrative. For the purposes of my overall investigation, there are four modes of interaction that revolve around the constructs of author, text, and reader: (1) the narrative world of Luke-Acts; (2) the fictive world of exchange between the implied author and implied reader; (3) the “plausible” world of the authorial audience – enmeshed within an ideological matrix of cultural issues encompassing gender, ethnicity, sex, religion, social codes, etc.; and (4) the world of the real reader.

³⁶The implied author changes to a more elaborate style in the body of argument vis-à-vis the use of inductive reasoning (i.e., examples) interspersed with deductive reasoning (i.e., both enthymemes and maxims). Cf. Demetrius (*On Style*, 12-35) who delineates four different styles, with the suggestion that most of the four can be used together to form even more alternatives: (1) the grand (or elevated) style, described as frigid; (2) the elegant style, described as affected; (3) the plain style, described as arid; and (4) the forceful style, described as unpleasant.

quality (*ethos*), an element present in most, if not all, of the speeches of Luke-Acts.³⁷ With this in mind, the use of maxims, in addition to associating an ethical base to the *logos* of Jesus' argument, bolsters the *ethos* of Jesus. Further, in terms of *pathos*, the implied author skillfully guides the implied reader to a favorable actualization of the narrative discourse by means of using familiar statements – elements comprising the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader.

3.2.1 Overarching Topos: Loving Your Enemies (6.27-28)

The statement of case consists of nine maxims. The first eight (vv.27-30) pertain to actions demanded of a disciple when faced with behavior contrary to traditional modes representative of honor and shame; situations where behavior exhibited towards a disciple function as an affront to her or his cultural honor. The final maxim (v.31) provides the rationale to the preceding eight maxims and serves as a transition to the statement of case.³⁸

³⁷For a detailed discussion of maxims and *ethos*, see Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.21.13-2.21.16.

³⁸Cf. Bovon (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 231) proposes a chiastic structure for vv.27-38:

- A Introduction (v.27a)
- B Love of enemies (vv.27b-28)
- C Renunciation of resistance (vv.29-30)
- D The Golden Rule (v.31)
- E Comparison with sinners (vv.32-34)
- E' Peculiar characteristic of Christians (v.35)
- D' Call to compassion (v.36)
- C' Not judging (v.37ab)
- B' Giving (vv.37c-38b)
- A' Measuring (v.38c)

Also, R. Conrad Douglas, “‘Love Your Enemies’: *Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos*,” in *Conflict and Invention*, 116-31, who proposes that Q 6.27-36 resembles a chreia tradent and comprised part of the first Q stratum. He subsequently proposes the following chreia parts: (1) *encomium*/introduction (v.27a); (2) chreia (v.27b); (3) paraphrase (vv.28b-31, 35a); (4) rationale (v.31); (5) converse (vv.32-34); (6) analogy (v.35b); (7) example (v.36); (8) judgment

The first four maxims (vv.27-28) of the statement of case closely correspond in form, with the present active imperative employed as the directive for each. The first maxim functions (v.27b) as an overarching summary for the subsequent three (vv.27c-28), which demarcates what it means to “love your enemies” (i.e., those displaying an affront in the latter three are all deemed “enemies” by cultural standards). Antistrophic use of ὑμᾶς also functions to tie together the latter three maxims and to distinguish them from the initial maxim:

Love your enemies

Do good to the ones who hate you (ὑμᾶς)

Bless the ones who curse you (ὑμᾶς)

Pray for the ones who abuse you (ὑμᾶς)

Through analeptic processing, the implied reader identifies τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν with the Jewish groups in 5.27-6.1 that exhibited hostility towards Jesus and his disciples (also addressed in the final entymemic blessing [vv.22-23]).³⁹ Connotations of their identity are broader, however, both within the context of the entire speech as well as the body of argument itself – notably the four ensuing maxims in vv.29-30.⁴⁰ Specifically, the first two maxims (v.29) address the actions demanded of a disciple when confronted by an “enemy” doling out calculated opposition, whereas the final

(missing); and (9) exhortation (missing).

³⁹Attempts to uncover a *Sitz im Leben* for Luke-Acts based on the final blessing (vv.22-23) and reference to τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (vv.27ff.) fail to consider the larger context of the speech; most who “peel back” the redactional layers posit the expulsion of Jewish Christians from the synagogue as the historical context (see, e.g., Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 227; Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 579-81; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, vol. 1, 333). Notwithstanding, as argued in this chapter, the parts, when assembled as a whole, prompt the implied reader to define “enemy” as individuals or groups who dispense cultural dishonor upon disciples.

⁴⁰Green, (*Gospel of Luke*, 272) makes a similar contention, albeit he does not pick up on the two-fold identification of “enemy” vis-à-vis the rhetorical positioning of the four maxims following the initial directive.

two (v.30) pertain to the actions expected when encountering a “different” type of enemy; a situation whereby someone outside the patronal boundaries of companionship and kinship is afforded the honor due only to a companion or kin.⁴¹ In the case of the first “enemy” type, the typical response would be adverse reciprocity. As to the second “enemy” type, an individual simply did not show generosity to those outside of patronal boundaries in Greco-Roman antiquity. In both instances, the narrative discourse overturns traditional mores: disciples are prompted to accept an inversion in social codes of friendship and kinship.⁴²

3.2.2 *What It Means to Love Your Enemies (6.29-30)*

The four maxims in vv.29-30 are more specific and elaborate than the initial four and delve into greater detail on the established *topos*: what it means to “love your

⁴¹For an analysis of the plausible *Sitz im Leben* of vv.29-30 (Matt 5.38-42) and the historical Jesus, see Walter Wink, “Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus’ Third Way (Matt 5:38-42//Luke 6:29-30),” *Forum* 7 (1991) 5-28.

⁴²Cf. Marius Reiser, “Love of Enemies in the Context of Antiquity,” *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001) 411-27, though he does not consider the rhetorical context of Matthew or Luke in delimiting the identity of “enemy” (“enemies” equal those who oppose another). Also, cf. Martin Ebner, “‘Feindesliebe – ein Ratschlag zum Überleben? Sozial- und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mt 5,38-47 par Lk 6,27-35,” in *From Quest to Q: Festschrift für James M. Robinson*, ed. Jon M. Asgeirsson, et al. (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000) 119-42, who sees the “rich” from within the Lukan congregation as the designate. Ebner’s approach is overly reductionistic and falsely assumes that the world of the text mirrors the world of the reader.

For a general discussion of friendship in Greco-Roman antiquity and its social mores, see W.H. Adkins, “‘Friendship’ and ‘Self-Sufficiency’ in Homer and Aristotle,” *Classical Quarterly* 13 (1963) 30-45; Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London: Routledge, 1989); Richard Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). For friendship and its relevance to the New Testament, see Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982); Bruce J. Malina, “Patron and Client: The Analogy behind Synoptic Theology,” *Forum* 4 (1988) 2-32.

enemies.”⁴³ Each maxim corresponds closely in form; the obligatory action follows the enemy to which it is due. Antithesis is employed in the first two (v.29), whereby two contrasting ideas are brought together.⁴⁴ While there is some difference in form and content between the first two (v.29) and second two sets of maxims (v.30), there is symmetry as well: (1) the preposition τῷ serves as a connective for the first maxim in both sets; (2) the second maxim in both sets exhibits antistrophe (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ); and (3) the directive in the second maxim of both sets is given in terms of a negative (μὴ).

To (τῷ) the one who strikes you on the cheek,
offer also the other (cheek).

And from the (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ) one who takes away your garment,
do not (μὴ) also withhold your shirt.

To (τῷ) everyone who begs from you,
give (listener must fill in the predicate).

And from the (καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ) one who takes away your things (τά)
(listener must fill in the predicate),
do not (μὴ) ask (listener must fill in predicate).

The first pair of maxims (v.29) are embedded in Greco-Roman cultural language, with the actions described as a direct affront to an individual’s honor. The requisite response – codified within Greco-Roman cultural mores – was retaliation, such that would enable erasure of the shame incurred and recovery of the lost honor. The directives given by Jesus are in contradistinction to the expected.⁴⁵ Specifically,

⁴³See W.C. van Unnik, “Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32-35,” *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966) 284-300, for an overview of the principles of Greco-Roman reciprocity of showing generosity towards one’s friends and hostility towards one’s enemies.

⁴⁴See *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.15; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 9.3.81, for a description of antithesis as rhetorical argument.

⁴⁵Cf. Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, “Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts,” 25-65, for a discussion of honor and shame in Luke-Acts. Also, see Alan C. Mitchell, “‘Greet the Friends by Name’: New Testament Evidence for the Greco-Roman *Topos* on Friendship,” in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald (Society of Biblical

the deductive argument of the maxims positions non-reciprocal benefaction as the requisite behavior (viz., actions) of a disciple.⁴⁶

The second pair of maxims (v.30) contain less verbiage than the first pair – specifically the absence of a predicate following the directive (viz., the imperative). The implied reader – and for that matter, the narrative audience – is required to identify the predicate in both cases using intratextual (viz., by means of analeptic and proleptic actualization) and extratextual data.⁴⁷ The first maxim (v.30a) relates to the proactive actions of a disciple, whereas the second maxim (v.30b) relates to the reactive actions of disciple. The implied reader, in regard to the first maxim, knows that Jesus has come to deliver salvation to those on the margin vis-à-vis the birth narratives (Lk 1-2), the initial speech of Jesus (4.14-30), and inaugural ministry activities (4.31-6.19). Processing of the remaining narrative further augments this picture for the implied reader; specific implications include sharing table fellowship with those traditionally excluded,⁴⁸ using one’s possessions and wealth to assist those

Literature Resources for Biblical Study, 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 236-57.

⁴⁶Reiser, “Love of Enemies,” 411-27; Conrad, “‘Love Your Enemies’,” 122-25. However cf. Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 591-600, who argues that the maxim to “love your enemies” in vv.27-28, while “seemingly absurd” (591), makes sense in terms of Greco-Roman ethics (via vv.29-38). Further, according to Betz, the “golden rule” maxim has an inadequate (vv.32-34) and adequate (v.35) understanding. Betz’s analysis fails in that there is significant evidence that the discourse of Luke-Acts frequently modifies or challenges conventional Greco-Roman reciprocity practices (see, e.g., Malina and Neyrey, “Honor and Shame,” 25-65).

⁴⁷Here it is important to note that the implied reader has a position of advantage in contrast to the narrative audience of Luke-Acts; the narrative audience has witnessed Jesus’ ministry and heard his message since Lk 3.7, whereas the implied reader is privilege to the *entire* narrative discourse and moreover can assimilate the “gap” through multiple lenses that include intratextual, extratextual, and intertextual data.

⁴⁸Cf. Lk 5.27-31; 7.36-50; 14.17-24; 16.19-31; 19.1-10; Acts 10.1-11.18; 16.39-40.

in need,⁴⁹ healing those afflicted with disease and possessed by demonic spirits,⁵⁰ and more. As to the second maxim, there are two “gaps” that the implied reader is prompted to fill. To begin, rather than noting the specific item in question (viz., that which has been taken), the implied author simply uses the article τά, which the implied reader can ascribe to a range of elements. Within the discourse of the speech as well as the entirety of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts, τά can denote both physical and non-physical possessions; the former include belongings such as possessions, property, and other means of wealth,⁵¹ whereas the latter include cultural status such as power and honor.⁵² The second “gap” is intertwined with the first; the implied reader must ascertain the predicate to μὴ ἀπαίτει (“do not ask”). Hence, in the case of physical possessions, a disciple does not take action to recover them and, in the case of non-physical possessions, a disciple does not retaliate to regain honor.

3.2.3 *Rationale for the Statement of Case (6.31)*

The final maxim (v.31) is different in content than the previous eight, providing a rationale for the directives specified in the eight preceding maxims – vis-à-vis an appeal to individual personal honor – and serving as a transition to the argument in the

⁴⁹Cf. Lk 8.1-3; 10.25-37; 12.13-48; 16.1-13, 14-18, 19-31; 18.18-30; 19.1-9, 11-27; 21.1-4; Acts 2.41-47; 4.32-5.11; 6.1-7; 9.36-43; 16.15, 40; 21.7-9, 16; 28.7-10, 11-16.

⁵⁰Cf. Lk 7.1-10; 7.11-17; 8.26-39; 8.40-56; 9.37-43; 13.10-17; 14.1-6; 17.11-19; 19.35-43; Acts 3.1-10; 5.12-16; 8.4-8; 9.32-35; 9.36-43; 14.8-18; 19.11-20; 20.7-12; 28.7-10.

⁵¹Cf. Lk 6.32-36; 8.1-3; 10.25-37; 12.13-48; 16.1-13, 14-18, 19-31; 18.18-30; 19.1-9, 11-27; 21.1-4; Acts 2.41-47; 4.32-5.11; 6.1-7; 9.36-43; 16.15, 40; 21.7-9, 16; 28.7-10, 11-16. Also, Moxnes (*Economy of the Kingdom*) who argues that Luke stipulates the need for economic redistribution in which the needy are cared for and the wealthy give without expecting anything in return. Conrad (“‘Love Your Enemies’,” 122-25) sees this tradent extending to the first stratum of Q.

⁵²Cf. Lk 4.25-27; 5.27-32; 7.36-50; 8.41b-48; 10.25-37; 14.7-14, 15-26; 15.11-32; 19.1-9; Acts 2.41-47; 4.32-5.11; 8.9-24; 8.26-40; 10.1-11.18; 16.15, 40.

body of argument.⁵³ The ambivalent nature of the maxim also opens up a virtual endless range of recipients for ethical action while circumscribing behavior as delineated in the preceding eight maxims as well as reflected in the subsequent body of argument, proscribing actions one would not want visited upon oneself and prescribing beneficial actions.⁵⁴ In addition, in contradistinction to the argument of the first eight maxims, whereby a disciple is charged with embracing actions antithetical to cultural systems, the argument of the final maxim coincides with cultural norms – rhetorical movement from *topoi* of disorientation to a *topos* of orientation.⁵⁵

⁵³The apparent dissonance between the “Golden Rule” in v.31 and the surrounding context purporting a dynamic of reciprocity is well attested – namely, the maxim directing “love of enemies” (v.27b) does not mesh with the reciprocity “golden rule” maxim (v.31). Plausible resolutions range from envisioning vv.32-34 as a critique of reciprocity via construing v.31 as an indicative statement (cf. Albrecht Dihle, *Die Goldene Regel: Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der antiken und frühchristlichen Vulgärethik* [Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962] 72-80; Victor Paul Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972] 57-58), to the presence of two separate sources – sayings on love of enemy and sayings on reciprocity – that were aggregated separately in Q (cf. Paul Hoffmann, *Tradition und Situation: Studien zur Jesusüberlieferung in der Logienquelle und den synoptischen Evangelien* [Münster: Aschendorff, 1995] 19-42), to associating the golden rule maxim of reciprocity with an ethic of equivalence and classifying “love of enemy” as a supra-ethic (Paul Ricoeur, “The Golden Rule: Exegetical and Theological Perplexities,” *New Testament Studies* 36 [1990] 392-97).

However, rather than envisioning the golden rule maxim as standing in contrast with the *topos* of reciprocity, Alan Kirk (“‘Love Your Enemies,’ The Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35),” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 [2003] 667-86) proposes that they are complimentary: “The golden rule, expressing the foundational, all-pervasive social norm of reciprocity, functions as a ‘starting mechanism’ that stimulates the kind of interaction necessary to bring into existence the envisioned social relations. Without the reciprocity motif, the command to love enemies remains orphaned from a social context; it is just an emotive slogan, not the inaugural note of a comprehensive vision.” (686)

⁵⁴See Kirk, “‘Love Your Enemies,’” 685, for this observation.

⁵⁵However cf. John Topel, “The Tarnished Golden Rule (Luke 6:31): The Inescapable Radicalness of Christian Ethics,” *Theological Studies* 59 (1998) 475-85, who argues that the “golden rule” maxim in v.31 goes beyond other Jewish and Greco-Roman reciprocity maxims. Notwithstanding, as Kirk notes (“‘Loving Your Enemies,’” 670-71), Topel’s reading of Jewish and Greco-Roman reciprocity maxim parallels is questionable.

3.3 Body of Argument (6.32-45)

The body of argument (vv.32-45), which breaks into three rhetorical segments, is a mixture of deductive and inductive argumentation. The content of the first two segments revolves around the two *topoi* established in the statement of case: that of showing unconditional patronage, even to those who repudiate traditional modes of cultural honor (vv.32-36), and that of embracing all individuals, regardless of social status and adherence to cultural norms (vv.37-42).⁵⁶ The first segment consists of a series of three examples in the form of maxims (vv.32-34) followed by a rationale in the form of two supporting enthymemes (vv.35-36); the initial enthymeme provides the rationale for desired patronage (v.35), whereas the latter functions as a paraenetic summary (v.36). The second segment is comprised of a series of four maxims (vv.37-38a) followed by a supporting enthymemic rationale (v.38b) and a parabolic example (vv.39-42). The final segment – consisting of two examples – functions as a rationale for the actions required of a disciple in the two previous segments (vv.43-45).

3.3.1 Unconditional Patronage: First Segment (6.32-36)

All three segments exhibit careful attention to the use of rhetorical style, though the first segment is perhaps the most replete. The design of the three examples, posed as rhetorical questions, is constructed with an aim of moving the listener to action.⁵⁷ The implied author's pleonastic association of sinners with the actions specified in each of the three rhetorical questions prompts the listener – both the implied reader as well as the narrative audience (the latter who would have been averse

⁵⁶Kirk, (“Love Your Enemies,” 673-82) makes the same connection.

⁵⁷See Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 9.2.6-9.2.7; Demetrius, *On Style*, 5.279 for a discussion of rhetorical questioning in ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric.

to being associated with sinners) – to embrace a different mode of patronage. The use of χάρις further situates the discourse in the context of cultural relationships; it prompts the listener to interpret the discourse through an extratextual repertoire of credit and payment – specifically, concrete favors friends do for each other and the gratitude shown in exchange, including the action of a debtor attempting to pay off a previous debt by returning benefit for benefit.⁵⁸ In particular, the inductive nature of the examples prompts the implied reader to take a more active role in making meaning from the discourse. The impetus for the specified action is delineated by means of the subsequent two enthymemes.⁵⁹

The three maxims (vv.32-34) exhibit careful rhetorical construction on the part of the implied author. Various modes of repetition play a key role in rhetorical amplification, including: (1) pleonastic use of the phrase (καὶ γὰρ) οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ following each question; (2) anaphoric use of καὶ εἰ at the beginning of each question; (3) antistrophic use of ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστὶν at the end of each question; (4) pleonastic use of ἀγαπάω in the first example, ἀγαθοποιέω in the second question, as well as δανίζω and λαμβάνω in the third question; (5) pleonastic use of ὑμᾶς at the same location in each question; and (6) duplicate positioning of ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς in the third question.⁶⁰

⁵⁸For a discussion of χάρις in Greco-Roman antiquity, see David Konstan, “Reciprocity and Friendship,” in *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, ed. Christopher Gill, Norman Postlewaite, and Richard Seaford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) 279-301; Kirk, “Love Your Enemies,” 678-81.

⁵⁹The conjunctive πλήν serves as a marker for the implied reader, denoting a change from inductive to deductive argumentation.

⁶⁰See *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.38.28, for an explanation of reduplication; the repetition of one or more words for the purpose of amplification.

And if (καὶ εἰ) you love (ἀγαπᾶτε) those who love (ἀγαπῶντας) you (ὁμᾶς), what credit is that to you (ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν)?

for even the sinners (καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ) love (ἀγαπῶσιν) those who love (ἀγαπῶντας) them.

(For) and if (καὶ γὰρ ἐάν) you do good (ἀγαθοποιήτε) to the ones who do good (ἀγαθοποιοῦντας) to you (ὁμᾶς), what credit is that to you (ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν)?

for even the sinners (καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ) do (ποιοῦσιν) the same.

And if (καὶ ἐάν) you lend (δανίσσητε) to the ones from whom you hope to receive (λαβεῖν), what credit is that to you (ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν)?

Even sinners (καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ) lend (δανίζουσιν) to sinners (ἁμαρτωλοῖς) to receive (ἀπολάβωσιν) as much.

Regardless, in keeping with stipulations of Greco-Roman rhetoric to avoid verbatim repetition and thus boredom on the part of the listener by maintaining some divergence in the employment of repetition,⁶¹ the implied author includes a somewhat obtrusive γάρ at the beginning of the second example,⁶² drops the connective γάρ at the beginning of the pleonastic conclusion for the third example, and omits the verb ἔστιν from the final question.⁶³ Further, the final example stands out from the previous two,

⁶¹See the instruction on the avoidance of repetition verbatim in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.42.54): “We shall not repeat the same thing precisely – for that, to be sure, would weary the hearer and not elaborate the idea – but with changes.” Also, Kennedy (*Through Rhetorical Criticism*, 21-22), who pinpoints the fundamental basis of rhetoric as amplification of a speaker’s positions, arguments, or theses.

⁶²The reading likely representative of the earliest manuscript tradition is that of καὶ γὰρ ἐάν. This claim is supported by several arguments: (1) it is certainly the more difficult reading – versus καὶ ἐάν; (2) its attestation is supported by the oldest, most reliable manuscripts (viz., P⁷⁵, N², B); and (3) a scribe deleted γάρ from N (N*). It is unclear as to why the implied author choose to include γάρ and moreover what rhetorical effect this decision may have had on the narrative discourse.

⁶³It is unlikely that ἐστίν can be traced back to the original text. While attested in several of the older and more reliable manuscripts (viz., A, N), its omission is supported by several other manuscripts that are comparable in terms of date and authenticity (viz., B, P⁴⁵, P⁷⁵) and moreover it is certainly the more difficult reading. This claim is also supported by the disjointed style of the overall narrative discourse of Luke-Acts, whereby the exclusion of connectives, articles, verbs, and so forth serve as rhetorical amplification.

as it is more elaborate in detail as well as in its use of repetition and, moreover, it makes a turn towards a specific issue.⁶⁴ All of the above compels the implied reader to acknowledge repetitive disruption, which, rather than detracting from, amplifies the rhetorical repetition. In addition, in the first of a series of such, the implied author employs a rhetorical “hook” to the proceeding discourse of the speech via the pleonastic use of ποιούσιν at the end of the second example (v.33);⁶⁵ namely, the use of ποιέω hearkens back to its use in the enthymematic summary (v.31) of the statement of case, thereby further accentuating the importance of action on the part of a disciple and demarcating the need for a disciple to perform actions that extend beyond traditional norms.

A complex enthymeme (v.35) followed by a simple enthymeme forms the supporting rationale of the body’s first segment (v.36). The minor premises for both enthymemes, which the implied reader is compelled to fill using abduction, equates those who follow the directives given by Jesus as being in accordance with the divine.⁶⁶

Enthymemic Rationale: Enacting the Three Examples (v.35)

Conclusion: Love your enemies, and do good and lend, expecting nothing in return.

Major Premise: God is kind to the ungrateful and selfish.

Minor Premise: Those whose reward is great and are sons of the Most High emulate the behavior and actions of the Most High.

⁶⁴Betz (*Sermon on the Mount*, 602) points out that the move to a specific *topos* in a third rhetorical question (v.34) serves to keep the listener alert.

⁶⁵The first to use the attribution, “hook word,” for the repetition between narrative sections is Joanna Dewey (*Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6* [Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 48; Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1980] 32). Also, Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 109-110.

⁶⁶And herein lies the rhetorical impact of the argument (which draws upon abduction): repudiation of Jesus’ directives equates to being in discordance with the divine.

Concluding Enthymemic Directive (v.36)

Conclusion: Disciples are to show mercy, emulating the actions of the Father.

Major Premise: The Father is merciful.

Minor Premise: Those who show mercy are like the Father.

The first enthymeme (v.35) delivers a rationale that coincides, almost verbatim, with the three preceding examples. In particular, its conclusion serves as a recitation of the three examples vis-à-vis its use of the action verbs contained in each (viz., ποιέω, ἀγαθοποιέω, δανίζω). It also links to the overall speech by means of pleonastic use of ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν – hooking back to the overarching theme of the statement of case (v.27). The abbreviated style of the enthymeme's conclusion – repetition of καί between the imperatives and lack of predicate descriptions following the last two imperatives – accentuates the impact of the directives. The minor premise exhibits the use of similar sounds that heighten the rhetorical impact of the enthymeme, namely, paronomasia⁶⁷ and homoeoteleuton.⁶⁸ In the case of the former, the predicate of divine action – χρηστός – closely corresponds in sound with the word used for the first recalcitrant recipient of that action – ἀχαρίστους (v.35c); the juxtaposition of these two very similarly sounding words increases the significance of the divine's action. The presence of paronomasia extends beyond the confines of the enthymeme, however, to the three-fold repetition of the phrase ποῖα ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν (viz., the subject χάρις); in doing so, the implied author distinguishes between those who abide according to the mores of Greco-Roman patronal society and those who emulate, in a

⁶⁷*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.21.29.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 4.21.28.

proactive manner, actions of the divine.⁶⁹ As to homoeoteleuton, the article plus the two recipients of the divine action have the same ending -ους (i.e., τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς).⁷⁰

The segment is immersed in language of Greco-Roman commerce and benefaction vis-à-vis μισθός, χάρις, and δανίζω. The use of μισθός (“payment”) – by means of the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader – forms a parallel to that of χάρις (“credit”) in the three preceding rhetorical questions (vv.32-34) and links to its earlier use in final woe (v.26). This occurs through analeptic processing by the implied reader and forms a *topos* that a disciple who embraces Jesus’ message will receive more than credit – namely, payment. Understood from the lens of Greco-Roman benefaction, the recipients of χάρις and μισθός stand at opposite ends of the friendship spectrum: a client receives χάρις with the obligation to show μισθός to the patron in return.⁷¹ The rhetorical argument deconstructs this cultural order: a client receives

⁶⁹Green (*Gospel of Luke*, 274-75) and Betz (*Sermon on the Mount*, 610-11) identify the word play between χάρις, χρηστός, and ἀχαρίστους and reach a similar conclusion.

⁷⁰Note the instructions on the use of homocoptoton, homoioteleuton, and paronomasia in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.22.29:

These last three figures . . . are to be used very sparingly when we speak in an actual cause, because their invention seems impossible without labor and pains. Such endeavors, indeed, seem more suitable for a speech of entertainment than for use in an actual cause. . . the grand and beautiful can give pleasure for a long time, but the neat and graceful quickly sate the hearing . . . ; but if we insert them infrequently and scatter them with variations throughout the whole discourse, we shall illuminate our style agreeably with striking ornaments.

⁷¹A “hook” with the state of case in the speech is also evoked by means of μισθός, where it appears in the final blessing (v.23) – which, as previously discussed, is demarcated by the implied author as of heightened importance via the intercalated enthymemic argument.

χάρις without the need to discharge μισθός to the patron.⁷² In this scenario a disciple (viz., patron) should not extend χάρις with the expectation of receiving μισθός (and thus honor) from a client; rather, the reciprocal μισθός will come from the divine.⁷³

But (πλὴν) love your enemies (ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν), and do good (ἀγαθοποιεῖτε) and lend (δανίζετε), expecting nothing in return and your payment (μισθός ← χάρις) will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High; for (ὅτι) God is kind (χρηστός) to the ungrateful and selfish (τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς).

The concluding enthymeme (v.36) manifests a very simplified directive.

Intertextual connections with LXX texts such as Pss 25.8; 86.5, Zech 1.16, Isa 63.15, and Sap 15.1 supplement the major premise that God is merciful. Like the concluding maxim at the end of the state of case (v.31), the concluding enthymematic directive (v.36) serves as both a summary for the first segment of the speech's argument as well as a transition to the ensuing segment (vv.37-42) of argument. The rhetorical impact of the enthymeme falls on the pleonastic use of οἰκτίρμος, which appears in both the conclusion and major premise.⁷⁴ In particular, use of οἰκτίρμος prompts the implied

⁷²See Betz (*Sermon on the Mount*, 604-08) who argues that the "lending" (δανίζω) in question relates to "loan" (μισθός) interest.

⁷³Cf. the similar conclusion of Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 274:

Those who act without expectation of return, even on behalf of their enemies, will be rewarded. Now, however, their reward does not consist of acts of gratitude from the recipients of their benefaction; rather, God rewards them. In the ethics of the larger Lukan world, a patron solidifies his or her position in the community by "giving," by placing others in his or her debt, and receiving from them obliged acts of service and reverence. In this new economy, however, the patron gives without strings attached, yet is still repaid, now by a third party, God, the great benefactor, the protector and the benefactor of those in need.

⁷⁴Redactional activity on the part of the implied author is evident here, in that thematic interest in hospitality is found elsewhere in the narrative discourse (e.g., Lk 1.50; 10.37) (cf.

reader to draw upon the aforementioned intertextual repertoire, where it is used in the context of describing divine sympathy towards humankind: non-reciprocal benefaction of disciples emulates the actions of the divine. The brevity of the enthymeme’s conclusion guides the implied reader to use information from the major premise not only to construct the minor premise but to adumbrate the conclusion in full. Rhetorical emphasis of the enthymeme falls upon the repetition of οἰκτίρμος:

Be merciful (οἰκτίρμονες),
just as even (καθὼς καὶ)⁷⁵ your Father is merciful (οἰκτίρμων).

Use of ὑψίστου (“Most High”) in v.35 to represent the divine creates an analeptic echo to Gabriel’s portention of Jesus’ birth to Mary (Lk 1.32), where Jesus is described as a υἱός of ὑψίστου. The rhetorical effect of this intertextual linkage is heightened vis-à-vis the permutation in the appellation to πατήρ (“Father”) in v.36. These intratextual connections prompt the implied reader to conclude that Jesus and disciples – just as υἱός (“children”) aspire to imitate the actions of their fathers (viz., ὑψίστου) – imitate the actions of the divine (in this case οἰκτίρμος).

3.3.2 Friendship Without Boundaries: Second Segment (6.37-42)

The second segment of the speech’s body (vv.37-42) begins with four maxims followed by a supporting enthymeme (vv.37-38). Two parabolic examples with an enclosed enthymeme conclude the segment (vv.39-42), which posit the need for

Ben Witherington III, “Editing the Good News: some synoptic lessons for the study of Acts,” in *History, Literature, and Society*, 333).

⁷⁵As to whether καὶ should be included as part of the text is unclear. The manuscript tradition is split, with its omission supported by B, N, among others and its inclusion by A, D, f³, the Latin and Syriac manuscript tradition, among others. Albeit its complication is slight, the more difficult reading is καθὼς καὶ. Consequently, all that can be said is that a much more detailed analysis of the manuscript tradition is required before an accurate assessment can be made.

disciples to embrace others regardless of social and religious standing. The four maxims (vv.37-38a) and supporting enthymeme (v.38bc) exhibit a number of rhetorical features that accentuate their impact. Some of the more obvious rhetorical features of the four maxims include the following. First, the first two maxims (v.37ab) are negative whereas the latter two are positive (vv.37c-38a); the rhetorical division coincides with a separation of content, with the first two pertaining to avoidance of negative actions and the latter two concerning the exhibition of proactive behavior.⁷⁶ Second, even though the entire speech is best characterized as replete with disjointed periods, the maxims here contain even less language, which evokes a heightened awareness on the part of the implied reader. Third, deviation in the form of the final maxim (v.38a) from that of the preceding three (v.37) – namely, the permutation from second person to first person – serves a rhetorical function of placing the emphasis on the directive within the final maxim of the series. The culmination of the four consecutive maxims also falls on the enactment of unconditional social and religious reciprocity vis-à-vis the final maxim. The first three maxims set the stage by codifying the thought processes that corroborate actions – that is, the decisions leading to a disciple embracing those outside of the boundaries of cultural companionship and kinship.

For the major premise of the supporting enthymeme (v.38bc), the implied author employs a metaphor – μετρόν καλόν – and accompanying metaphoric language – in the form of three consecutive descriptive adjectival participles – πεπιεσμένον,

⁷⁶See, e.g., Nolland (*Luke*, vol. 1, 300-01) and I. Howard Marshall (*The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [New International Greek Testament Series; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978] 265) for a similar conclusion, though not on the basis of rhetorical analysis.

σεσαλευμένον, ὑπερεκχυννόμενον. The even more disjointed style than the preceding discourse of the body, coupled with the elevated impact of the three consecutive participles as well as the four-fold sequential repetition of -μενον (as well as five-fold sequential use of -ον), serves as a rhetorical signal to the implied reader that the enthymeme is to receive heightened notice.⁷⁷ The use of μετρὸν καλόν and the ensuing three adjectival participles evokes a rural, agrarian extratextual repertoire as well as intertextual repertoire on the part of the implied reader. Though there is not an extant text containing an amalgamated combination of the words, the subject μετρὸν καλόν likely denotes a measure used for grain, whereas the adjectival participles convey eschatological inklings via their typical use in the LXX and elsewhere.⁷⁸ The result of the combination is the deduction that the measure is filled beyond capacity, so that the grain overflows. The conclusion of the enthymeme culls the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader again in that grain contracts frequently specify that grain delivery and payment be measured with the same instrument.⁷⁹

Use of three consecutive perfect participles in the supporting enthymeme – πεπιεσμένον, σεσαλευμένον, and ὑπερεκχυννόμενον – serves as a discourse marker

⁷⁷The consecutive deployment of the same ending is designated as homocoteleuton; a rhetorical device that accentuates the impact of the discourse (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.21.28).

⁷⁸Cf. the use of ὑπερεκχύννω in Joel 2.24 and the scattered use of σαλεύω in the LXX (e.g., Hab 2.16; Zech 12.2; Jer 10.10; Ezek 12.18; Isa 63.19; Sir 16.18).

⁷⁹See H. P. Rüger, “Mit welchem Mass ihr messt, wird euch gemessen werden (Mt 7:2, Gen 38:25-26),” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60 (1969) 174-82; B. Couroyer, “De la mesure dont vous mesurez il vous sera mesuré,” *Revue Biblique* 77 (1970) 366-70. The receptacle for dispensing the grain – κόλπος – is either the fold in the garment at the girdle that serves as a pocket or the actual skirt of the garment (when large quantities are represented). An intertextual allusion to the use of κόλπος in Isa 65.6-7 would suggest to the implied reader that those who fail to dispense the “good” measure risk evoking the wrath of the divine as exhibited in Deutero-Isaiah (e.g., 59.1-20; 64.1-12; 65.1-16; 66.14-16).

for the implied reader; the change to the perfect tense raises the enthymeme above the rest of the discourse.⁸⁰ As a complex rhetorical structure comprises the enthymeme, the discourse prompts the implied reader to draw on information from the preceding four maxims, in addition to the enthymeme contained in the initial segment of the speech's body, to fulfill the deductive reasoning warranted by the implied author.⁸¹

Major Premise: The measure a disciple gives will be the measure a disciple gets back.

Minor Premise: Good measure is equated with not judging, not condemning, forgiving, and giving.

Conclusion: Those who do not judge, do not condemn, forgive, and give will receive good measure.

Conclusion: Those who judge, condemn, do not forgive, and do not give will *not* receive good measure.

The final portion of the second segment of the speech's body consists of an intercalation: two parabolic examples (vv.39, 41-42) surrounding an enthymeme (v.40). The introjection by the narrator (i.e., "he spoke to them also a parable" in v.39a) intrudes on the discourse – by interrupting the narrative flow – and thus serves as a rhetorical marker for the implied reader. Specifically, an amorphous reference to the recipient audience by means of αὐτοῖς in the narrative aside pulls the implied reader back to the beginning of the speech (vv.17-19 and then v.20), where the exact identity of the "disciple" character group is unclear. In addition, while the identity of a "disciple" is much more apparent at this point in the speech than at its beginning, it is

⁸⁰For the change in verbal tense to the perfect tense, see Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2d (Biblical Languages Greek, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992) 298-307, esp. 301-02.

⁸¹Vernon K. Robbins, "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13," in *Literary Studies*, 196-98, 200-01, recognizes the enthymematic argument of Lk 6.38, and, though he does not delineate a two-fold set of major premises and conclusions, he identifies a connection with the preceding four maxims.

not until the conclusion of the speech (vv.46-49) that the implied reader reaches the understanding that “disciples” are those characters who enact Jesus’ teachings.

The first parable (v.39) invokes an extratextual repertoire rooted in Greco-Roman rhetoric, one that had achieved proverbial status, as well as intratextual connotations via the narrative discourse to this point – namely, the term “blind” denotes those who lack faith or insight.⁸² For the implied reader the inductive result is the repudiation of those characters and character groups who fail to understand Jesus’ teaching and exhibit faithlessness. The rhetorical impact of the parable is accentuated by means of the repetition of τυφλὸς τυφλόν. The central point of the narrative unit is predicated in the enthymeme (v.40), with the implied author departing from the metaphorical language of the parable and with the specific notation that the “disciple” is in purview. It also is obvious to the implied reader that the identity of the “teacher” is to be equated with Jesus, as the actions of those who purport to be teachers in the previous narrative run directly counter to the inductive conclusions prompted by the preceding parable – namely, the implied reader deductively concludes that those characters who attempt to elevate themselves above their teachers (viz., Jesus in this context) are blind. Based on prior narrative, the implied reader places the Pharisees and lawyers in this category, as they are shown in several scenes elevating themselves above Jesus (cf. 5.17-26; 6.1-5, 6-11). Characters within the narrative whom the implied reader places in this category. The minor premise of the enthymeme, which the implied reader must deduce, conveys additional meaning; a teacher aspires to elevate

⁸²The proverb of “the blind leading the blind” is well known in antiquity, with “blind leader” (ὁδηγὸς τυφλός) employed as a descriptive for exposing incompetence on the part of a leader. For this observation, see Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 620-21; Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 248.

disciples to the same status level – seeking an egalitarian relationship; the result is that disciples exemplify the characteristics embodied by the teacher.

Intercalated Enthymeme (v.40)

Conclusion: A disciple becomes like the teacher when fully taught.

Minor Premise: A teacher aspires to elevate disciples to the same level of status.

Major Premise: A disciple never considers oneself above one's teacher.

The narrative discourse in the second parabolic example (vv.41-42) suddenly changes to the second person, from the first-person discourse of the first parabolic example and enthymeme. This functions as a rhetorical tool, bringing the discourse closer to the implied reader, with the two questions posed directly at both the narrative audience and the implied reader. The two-fold rhetorical questioning necessitates activity on the part of the narrative audience and the implied reader, answers that are predetermined by means of the meshing of the parables in well-known sayings.⁸³ The shifting of the verb in the second clause of both questions, in contrast to the earlier positioning in the first clause, also serves a rhetorical function, disallowing activity on the part of the implied reader until all of the argument has been heard.⁸⁴ The addition of the appellation ἀδελφεῖ focuses the discourse on the interaction within the Christian community by employing language used to designate community relationships.

⁸³Some of the more notable examples from Greco-Roman literature who condemn the shortcoming of reproving others when suffering from the same shortcoming include Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.18.16-17; Plutarch, *De curios*, 515d; Horace, *Sat.*, 1:3:25.

⁸⁴Asyndeton, that is, omission of the connective ἥ, at the start of the second question in v.42 also serves a rhetorical function, creating a disjunctive gap in the discourse that results in the accentuation of the argument. The omission of the connective is of some question in the manuscript tradition. Asyndeton is corroborated by the oldest and most reliable manuscripts, however, and moreover there is a viable rhetorical reason for the omission of the connective ἥ.

It is important to note here that the corrective action on the part of a disciple is nowhere condemned in the discourse. Those who recognize their own shortcomings when correcting fellow disciples are *not* in purview of the discourse, but rather those who take corrective action without recognizing their own shortcomings.⁸⁵ Extratextual connotations surrounding the nomenclature ὑποκριτά corroborate this understanding, which possesses either the notation of someone whose behavior is not determined by the divine or someone playing a role by acting a part in a Greco-Roman theater – both of which are part of the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader.⁸⁶ Either one or a combination of both suggests that the one who fails to acknowledge her or his shortcomings while judging others is incongruent with that stipulated by the divine and moreover is simply camouflaging shortcomings by acting out a part. This understanding coincides with what has preceded, namely, stereotyping and judging on the basis of social, ethnic, and religious location is inconsistent with the teachings of Jesus.⁸⁷

3.3.3 *Rationale for the Body: Third Segment (6.43-45)*

The final section of the speech's body (vv.43-45) provides the rationale for the reasoning of the first two sections in the form of three parabolic examples. The first two parables are enshrouded in extratextual and intertextual meaning, encapsulating well-known agrarian symbols as well as language from the LXX. Intratextual linkage

⁸⁵See, e.g., Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 626-28.

⁸⁶For the latter, see Job 34.30; 36.13; 2 Mac 6.21-25; 4 Mac 6.15-23; Ps(s) of Sol 4.5-6, 22. For more in-depth analysis of the extratextual connotations of "hypocrite," see Robert H. Smith, "Hypocrite," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight (Downers Grove and Leicester: InterVarsity, 1992) 351-53.

⁸⁷Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 279.

to the summary of John the Baptist’s message in Lk 3.7-14 also exists via the metaphorical use of “fruit” as representative of human conduct.⁸⁸ All three parables resemble complex enthymemes. The first two enthymemes share the same minor premise (v.44a). Unlike most other enthymemes in the Lukan discourse, the conclusions must be completed by the implied reader, a rhetorical maneuver by the implied author that helps accentuate the importance of the closing rhetorical argument of the speech’s body.

<i>Conclusion:</i> A good tree produces good fruit and is known for it.	<i>Conclusion:</i> A bad tree produces bad fruit and is known for it.
---	---

<i>Major Premise:</i> No good tree produces bad fruit.	<i>Major Premise:</i> No bad tree produces good fruit.
--	--

Minor Premise: Each tree is known for its fruit.

The second enthymeme (v.44) is a reversal in reasoning; unlike the first enthymeme, where the implied reader concludes that each tree is known for its fruit (vis-à-vis the minor premise), the implied reader in the case of the second enthymeme is prompted to construe both the thornbush and the bramble bush by what is *not* produced. Also of interest is that both enthymemes share the same minor premise (v.44); the implied reader anticipates the same structure as with the first enthymeme – namely, that the minor premise will come at the end of the enthymeme – and is prompted to use the minor premise from the first enthymeme to build coherence when processing the second enthymeme.

<i>Conclusion:</i> A thorn is known for producing bad fruit, not good fruit such as figs.	<i>Conclusion:</i> A bramble bush is known for producing bad fruit, not good fruit such as grapes.
---	--

⁸⁸See Green (*ibid.*, 279), who also identifies this intratextual connection.

Major Premise: Figs are not gathered from thorns.

Major Premise: Grapes are not picked from a bramble bush.

Minor Premise: Each are known for their fruit.

The enthymemes in vv.43-44 display some rhetorical features that accentuate the impact on the implied reader. The most obvious is the use of repetition, which is evident in several modes. The first is the use of homoioteleuton in both of the major premises of the first enthymeme: δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν in v.43a and δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν in v.43b. The minor premise also exhibits homoioteleuton in the repetition of τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ in v.44a. The second is the anaphoric construction of the two enthymemes: both begin with οὐ γάρ, and οὐδέ serves as the transition between the two major premises. An additional rhetorical feature of the two enthymemes resembles *synkrisis*. The first enthymeme uses the metaphor of δένδρον as a means to place both of the major premises in contrast (i.e., a good tree bears good fruit and a bad tree bears bad fruit in v.43a). The second enthymeme draws upon two comparable examples (i.e., figs do not come from thorns and grapes do not come from a bramble bush in 44bc) to accomplish a similar rhetorical result – namely, juxtaposition of the metaphors produces the dual conclusions.

The implied author in the final enthymeme (v.45) moves the parabolic language – and thus *topos* – closer to the implied reader by making a transition from the agrarian world to that of humankind. The narrative texture retains rhetorical similarity with the two preceding enthymemes by employing the same format: two conclusions and major premises and a shared minor premise. Yet the “gap” the implied reader is required to fill narrows, in that the analogies in the major premises do not necessitate processing.

Accordingly, unlike the previous two enthymemes where the implied reader needs to deduce the contrast (viz., if a good/bad tree cannot produce bad/good fruit, then it must produce good/bad fruit), no action is required on the part of the implied reader (viz., good/bad person produces good/bad treasure).

Conclusion: The substance of a good person is exemplified by the good treasure of her or his heart.

Conclusion: The substance of an evil person is exemplified by the evil treasure of her or his heart.

Major Premise: A good person produces good from the good treasure of her or his heart.

Major Premise: An evil person produces evil from the evil treasure of her or his heart.

Minor Premise: The actions of a person are predicated on the substance of her or his heart.

Like the previous two enthymemes, the concluding enthymeme in v.45 draws on repetition, including several instances of homoioteleuton and similar rhetorical construction of both major premises: (1) the three-fold use of ἀγαθός followed by the three-fold use of πονηρός in the two major premises; (2) the repetition of προφέρω to describe the action that eventuates from both the good and evil person; and (3) the focus of the minor premise and conclusions on καρδία as the origin for a person’s action. Also consistent with ancient rhetorical style, θησαυρός is implied in the second enthymeme, a maneuver requiring the implied reader to fill the subject of the genitive clause ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Another rhetorical nuance relates to the ambiguous meaning of προφέρω, with the implied reader prodded to look elsewhere for its reference. The search for meaning is not a long quest; the agricultural intratext of the preceding enthymemes (vv.43-44) supplies the information the implied reader needs in order to fill the missing verbal “gap” – ποιέω.

3.4 Conclusion (6.46-49)

The conclusion (vv.46-49) of the speech is carefully crafted for maximum rhetorical impact. A perplexing conundrum for the implied reader is posed in the conclusion of the enthymeme from the body of the speech (v.45c); that is, biological norms dictate that a person speaks from the mouth, not from the heart. This rhetorical ploy melds into the building crescendo of the discourse, accentuating the importance of a disciple's action *contra* actual speech. The implied reader is led to this conclusion by the conclusion, whereby the "successful" disciple is the one who listens to Jesus' words and responds with appropriate action, whereas the disciple who fails does not enact Jesus' teachings. Inculcation entails more than corresponding speech; action is a non-negotiable requisite.

The conclusion departs from the enthymematic argument representative of most of the preceding speech. Rather, the implied author directly confronts the implied reader by posing a question for which there is no correct answer. The use of ποιέω in the rhetorical question (v.46) and its repetition at the beginning of each example (vv.47, 49) forms an intratextual connection with the preceding argument of the body of the speech, particularly the concluding rationale in vv.43-44. The prior enthymematic argument in vv.43-45, when combined with the rhetorical discourse of the conclusion, ensnares Jesus' audience in a rhetorical trap. Further, the prior extratextual repertoire that places the interaction between disciples and other members of society in the context of patron-client relations carries over into the conclusion vis-à-vis the appellative use of κύριε.⁸⁹ Accordingly, Jesus situates himself in the position

⁸⁹As noted by Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 280.

of a patron and the disciples (both “real” and “would be”) in the position of clients. The effect of this rhetorical maneuver is that honor and shame protocols associated with the patron-client relationship necessitate that disciples respond to Jesus with more than words; they must reciprocate with action.

The ethical dimensions of Jesus’ instruction is couched by the use of ὑποδεικνύω, a term employed in Hellenistic and Rabbinical ethical instruction.⁹⁰ Use of rhetorical contrast via the two examples (vv.47-49) is a common construction in Greco-Roman rhetoric.⁹¹ Close resemblance in the form of both examples heightens the rhetorical impact of the discourse, thereby prompting the implied reader to comparison: (1) θεμελίος as the essential building element needed in the construction of a house (vv.48b, 49a); (2) ὁμοιος to begin each example; (3) ἀκούω to describe the receptive activity of the disciple equated with each example; (4) ποιέω to denote the response of each disciple upon hearing Jesus’ instructions; (5) οἰκοδομέω (accompanied by οἶκος) to describe the activity of the subject; (6) change from the present to past tense for οἰκοδομέω; and (7) exclusion of the descriptive noun πλημμύρης in the second example.

The composition of the two examples exhibits further rhetorical arrangement in that the predicate of ἀκούω and ποιέω – μου τῶν λόγων for ἀκούω and αὐτοῦς for ποιέω – is absent in the second example (v.49a) – an omission indicative of compelling rhetorical argument. John the Baptist’s prediction in Lk 3.17 that Jesus would bring division and strife is further confirmed as the speech comes to a close; ethical contrast

⁹⁰For a discussion of the extratextual repertoire, see Harvey K. McArthur and Robert M. Johnston, *They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1990) 184-85.

⁹¹Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.19; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.40-4.43.

translates into taxonomic characterization: characters and character groups who listen and enact Jesus' words, on the one hand, and those who listen but fail to act, on the other. In doing so, the implied author adds further elements to the foundation of the taxonomic characterization found in the fourth speech (8.4-18), which I will discuss in detail in chapters seven and nine.

4 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

The rhetorical situation of the second speech of the Galilean ministry – vis-à-vis intertextual echoes and intratextual linkages – builds upon earlier discourse bolstering Jesus' *ethos* to the implied reader by situating the speech within the context of Moses' dissemination of the law. In addition, its *topoi* coincide with many of those established in the first speech (4.14-30), thus compelling the implied reader to bring coherence to the narrative. The speech aims to persuade the narrative audience to a new mode of ethical action – specifically non-reciprocal benefaction.

Contra the assessment of some scholars, the speech exhibits a significant degree of attention to rhetorical argument, both inductive and deductive: examples, maxims, rhetorical questioning, and enthymemes. In addition to the inherent rhetorical invention, arrangement, and style of the speech, redaction of Q by the implied author reveals attention to the formation of rhetorical argument that engenders and buttresses larger narrative trajectories. From a rhetorical standpoint, the implied author includes various “gaps” in the discourse, largely by means of enthymemic argument, that the implied reader must “fill” in order to make sense of the narrative. This activity accentuates certain narrative trajectories, including the importance of ethical action

and, in particular, the mode of non-reciprocal benefaction. These will be discussed in greater detail in chapters nine and ten.

6

THIRD GALILEAN SPEECH (LK 7.24-35): JESUS, JOHN THE BAPTIST, AND THEIR DISCIPLES AND OPPONENTS

A majority of scholarly investigation involving the third speech of Jesus in the Galilean ministry (7.24-35) revolves around redactional analysis, the identification of Lukan interests through modifications made to Q.¹ Recently, there have been several attempts to query the narrative from the standpoint of how the discourse contributes to the construction of characterization for John the Baptist.² Regardless, few, if any, pay heed to the rhetorical texture of the narrative discourse. Instead, I propose that a reading of the narrative in terms of its rhetorical argument provides useful insight into larger narrative trajectories that shape the overarching narrative discourse of Luke-Acts.

1 RHETORICAL SITUATION

The transition from the second speech to the subsequent healing episode in 7.1 exhibits several rhetorical features that heed reference. First, reference to the narrative

¹See, e.g., Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 276-88; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) 107-21.

²See, e.g., Darr, *Character Building*, 60-84.

audience – that is, the “people” (λαός) – points the implied reader back to the beginning of the second speech in 6.17-19, where the same audience was identified by the narrator. Absence of “disciples” in 7.1, *contra* 6.17-19, serves a rhetorical purpose; the implied author guides the implied reader to distinguish between disciples – namely, those whose actions embody the message and ministry of Jesus – and those who are not disciples – namely, those whose actions fail to coincide with Jesus’ ministry and message. The second involves the close resemblance between Jesus’ words (ῥήματος) in 7.1 and the demise (ῥήγμα) met by those who do not heed Jesus’ words in the second example of the conclusion (6.49), a likely rhetorical “pun” (known as paraonomasia)³ emphasizing the importance of adherence to Jesus’ teaching. Finally, association of the narrative audience with those who just heard the preceding speech via the use of ἀκούω further accentuates the connection between listening to Jesus’ words and the act of appropriation; the implied author leaves “little excuse” for the narrative audience – and for that matter the implied reader – not to listen to Jesus’ teaching and to follow with action.

Both temporal and spatial markers demarcate to the implied reader that 7.1ff. initiates a new section. The end of the section is signaled again by temporal and spatial markers in 8.1. The message communicated in the initial two speeches of the Galilean ministry and depicted in various action scenes embedded between the two speeches coalesces in 7.1-50, which consists of three “example” stories (vv.1-10; vv.11-17; vv.36-50), a chreia (vv.17-23), and a speech (vv.24-35). The first two exemplary stories form an intertextual intersection with the Elisha and Elijah LXX narratives, to

³*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.21; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.11.7

which prior reference occurred in the body of the inaugural ministry speech (4.24-27). The first example (7.1-10) – the healing of the Centurion’s slave – articulates a prophetic ministry exercised to the Gentiles and parallels the Naaman episode (2 Kgs 5.1-19).⁴ The second example (7.11-17) – the raising of the widow’s son at Nain – closely mirrors Elijah’s ministry to the disenfranchised within Israel through parallels with the raising of the son belonging to the widow at Zarephath in Sidon (1 Kgs 17.10-24). The intertextual association of Jesus’ ministry with that of Elisha and Elijah is given further impetus by the analeptic reference to the first speech (4.25-27) – specifically, their ministries to Gentiles and the disenfranchised.⁵

2 AN AMPLIFIED CHREIA

The section preceding the speech (vv. 17-23) resembles an amplified chreia.⁶ The narrative introduction (vv. 17-18) establishes the context for the *quaestio* (vv. 19-20). The duplication of the questioning in the *quaestio* (seeking rationale) – first John the Baptist to his disciples (v. 19) and then his disciples to Jesus (v. 20) – serves to

⁴However, cf. Thomas L. Brodie, “Not Q but Elijah: The Saving of the Centurion’s Servant (Luke 7:1-10) as an Internationalization of the Saving of the Widow and Her Child (1 Kings 17:1-16),” *Irish Biblical Studies* 14 (1992) 54-71, who sees an intertextual connection with 1 Kgs 17.1-16 rather than 2 Kgs 5.1-19.

⁵For a description of the intertextual connections between Elisha’s and Elijah’s ministries (viz., Elijah’s encounter with the widow from Zarephath and Elisha’s encounter with Naaman) and Jesus’ encounters with the Centurion and widow from Zarephath in Lk 7.1-17, see Thomas L. Brodie, “Towards an Unravelling of Luke’s Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17-24,” *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986) 247-67; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 284-85.

⁶For a description of expanded chreia, see Vernon K. Robbins, “Introduction: Using Rhetorical Discussions of the Chreia to Interpret Pronouncement Stories,” *Semeia* 64 (1993) ix, xiii-xvi. The expanded chreia would typically consist of a narrative introduction, a digressio, a quaestio (seeking rationale), a chreia, paraphrase of the chreia, example(s), rationale or statement supporting example, and conclusion.

elongate narrative time, thus accentuating the importance of Jesus' response to the implied reader. The chreia (v.21) is followed by a paraphrase (v.22). Repetition between the chreia and the paraphrase heightens the rhetorical significance of the argument, with Isaianic intertextual connections (29.18; 35.5-6; 42.18; 61.1) providing the implied reader with an analeptic linkage to the inaugural speech (4.18-20); the latter of which provides confirmation that Jesus is doing what he previously indicated he would do in the initial speech. The conclusion (v.23), which is in the form of a maxim, provides a dramatic finish for the implied reader and narrative audience (viz., the disciples of John the Baptist) and sets the stage for the ensuing speech.⁷ The rhetorical argument of vv.17-23 is deductive and requires the implied reader and narrative audience to answer the question posed by John the Baptist and his disciples; the implied author does not include an affirmative response by Jesus but rather a description of Jesus' ministry and a corresponding summary by Jesus – an embodiment of the prophetic principles found in Isaiah, whereby the expected Messiah would deliver “salvation” to the disenfranchised.⁸

⁷The amplified chreia in Lk 7.17-23 resembles the following parts: (1) narrative introduction (vv.17-18); (2) *quaestio* (vv.19-20); (3) chreia (v.21); (4) paraphrase (v.22); and (5) conclusion (v.23).

⁸However cf. Ron Cameron, ““What Have You Come Out to See?” Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels,” *Semeia* 49 (1990) 35-69, who argues that Lk 7.18-35 resembles an elaborate chreia: (1) praise (missing); (2) chreia (vv.18-19, 22); (3) rationale (v.23); (4) statement of the opposite (vv.24-26); (5) statements by an authority (vv.27-28); (6) statement from analogy (vv.31-32); (7) statement from example (vv.33-34); and (8) concluding periodization (v.35). Not all pieces of the chreia are present, however, and the individual pieces do not all fit together exactly – for example, the chreia breaks into two parts (vv.18-19 and v.21) and is separated by material (v.20) that does not fit into the arrangement of the chreia.

The speech is replete with *ecphrasis* and *synkrisis*. The rhetorical argument is directed at persuading the implied reader and narrative audience to judge the *ethos* of John the Baptist and, though in a much less direct manner, the *ethos* of Jesus in a positive light.⁹ The intratextual stage for the third speech is set at the end of the second example regarding the raising of the widow's son at Nain (7.11-17): Jesus is recognized as a "great prophet" – one imbued with the divine – by those attending the miraculous resurrection of the widow's son (vv.16-17). This marks growing narrative momentum in that all present identify Jesus and his ministry as representative of the prophets, and moreover the report extends not only to the surrounding region but to Judea (i.e., versus the earlier report in 4.37 that simply spread to the surrounding region and, in addition, did not specifically note the subject matter).

Like Jesus' first two Galilean ministry speeches, the third speech embodies a number of rhetorical devices. Specifically, it exhibits close affinity with the pronouncement story – with the expanded chreia in the previous section being expanded to an elaborated response-chreia.¹⁰ The preceding scene – specifically the chreia and its paraphrase (vv.21-23) – establishes the rhetorical situation. Inclusion of a narrative aside (7.29-30), a strategy employed in various places of the Luke-Acts narrative, allows the narrator to intervene in the story and provide the implied reader

⁹See Patrick J. Hartin, "'Yet Wisdom Is Justified by Her Children' (Q 7:35): A Rhetorical and Compositional Analysis of Divine Sophia in Q," in *Conflict and Invention*, 151-64; Cameron, "Characterization in the Gospels," 50-63.

¹⁰See, e.g., Vernon K. Robbins, "Pronouncement Stories from a Rhetorical Perspective," *Forum* 4 (1988) 1-31, for an overview of pronouncement stories as an evolution of chreia.

with information relevant to the story to which the narrative audience is not privy.¹¹

The introduction in vv.24-27 introduces the *topos*, with the help of a narrative description in v.24a: the *ethos* of John the Baptist and his relationship to Jesus. The chreia occurs in the final part of the introduction, where Jesus cites an amalgamated form of Mal 3.1 and Exod 23.20: “Behold, I send my messenger before you who shall prepare your way before you” (7.27). The statement of case of the speech (v.28), accompanied by a narrative aside, (vv.29-30), posits the purpose of the speech. In particular, the intervening narrative aside serves as a narrative *digressio* and provides the implied reader with information for use in processing the body of the speech (vv.31-34); the identity of the individuals from the contemporary generation. The body corresponds with the chreia argument in that it includes an example (v.31-32) followed by the rationale behind the example (vv.33-34). The conclusion (v.35) confirms the argument of the body and, as a succinct aphorism, provides for a dramatic finish to the speech. In all, the third speech breaks into the following chreia-like arrangement:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Narrative Introduction (vv.17-23) | 5. <i>Digressio</i> (vv.29-30) |
| 2. <i>Quaestio</i> (vv.24-26) | 6. Statement by Analogy (vv.31-32) |
| 3. Chreia (v.27) | 7. Statement by Example (vv.33-34) |
| 4. Rationale (v.28) | 8. Conclusion (v.35) |

3 RHETORICAL TEXTURE

That the subject matter of the speech relates to John the Baptist is not in question because of the inclusion of the narrative transition prior to the introduction in v.24a. The narrative transition is needed, as the preceding scene in 7.17-23 addresses

¹¹See Steven M. Sheeley, *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 72; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992) 97-185.

the *ethos* of Jesus. Notwithstanding, there is a close narrative relationship between the inquiry from John the Baptist regarding the *ethos* of Jesus in vv. 17-23 and Jesus' oration on the *ethos* of John the Baptist in 7.24-35; the end result is a positive judgment of both characters, with Jesus and his followers receiving greater import, a *topos* previously articulated in the intertwined birth accounts of John the Baptist and Jesus in 1.5-2.52.¹² Consonance with the inaugural speech of Jesus in 4.16-30 occurs via the close correspondence in language between it and the preceding narrative that describes the ministry of Jesus (cf. 7.23-24 = 4.18).¹³ In addition to the more obvious intratextual connections with the first speech in the Galilean ministry, including near verbatim repetition and intertextual usage, there is significant linkage with Jesus' second speech (6.20-49) in the Galilean ministry.¹⁴

3.1 Introduction (7.24-27)

The ambivalence of John the Baptist and his disciples regarding the *ethos* of Jesus is prompted by the report about Jesus' ministry to Judea and all of the surrounding countryside (7.17). The derivation is understandable considering the ostensible differences in the ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus: the former prophesies severe punishment and a coming one who would bring judgment, whereas

¹²Green, *Theology of the Gospel*, 51-55.

¹³See Suzanne Marie Kearney, *A Study of Principal Compositional Techniques in Luke-Acts based on Lk 4:16-30 in Conjunction with Lk 7:18-23* (Ph.D. diss, Boston University, 1978).

¹⁴The most notable instance would be the use of μακάριος in v.23, which culls the introduction of the second speech (6.20-23). In addition, some of the recipients of Jesus' ministry in 7.21-22 coincide with those in the groups specified in the introduction of the speech (6.20-26).

the latter proclaims a message of inclusion and forgiveness. Nevertheless, because the implied reader possesses knowledge not privy to the narrative audience, the dissonance of John the Baptist and his followers is only perceived by the implied reader, not the narrative audience – namely, the narrative audience does not have access to the analeptic linkage in 3.1-18, where John the Baptist’s ministry to the people and tax collectors and his rejection by the Pharisees and lawyers is detailed.

The narrative introduction in v.24a suggests to the implied reader that Jesus is about to deliver an oration. The rhetorical arrangement – questioning followed by the corresponding answer – is a common Greco-Roman rhetorical device.¹⁵ The three-fold repetition of the question τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν (θεάσασθαι in the first question in v.24b) builds to an inexorable conclusion, with the initial two questions leading the narrative audience to the determination that John the Baptist was a figure of great significance – a prophet, the Elijah figure who would forerun the coming of the Messiah.¹⁶ The addition of the conjunctive ἀλλά to the second and third inquiries as well as permutation in the infinitive from θεάσασθαι to ἰδεῖν for the second and third queries heightens the rhetorical impact of the introduction. The implied reader, privy to the preceding narrative, already associates John the Baptist with the anticipated Elijah figure via the birth accounts (1.16-17, 76). Corroboration of the claim is made through the intertextual citation of Mal 3.1 and Exod 23.20; the bulk of the citation is contingent on Mal 3.1, with the primary deviation resulting in the permutation of the

¹⁵Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.18; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.22-24; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 9.3.98.

¹⁶For a discussion of intertextual connections between the characterization of John the Baptist and Elijah, see Robert J. Miller, “Elijah, John, and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke,” *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988) 611-22.

first-person pronoun (“before me”) to the second person (“before you”).¹⁷ This change results in greater existential urgency for both the narrative audience and the implied reader.

3.2 Statement of Case (7.28)

The statement of case (v.28) defines the purpose of the speech: John the Baptist was a prophetic figure of great consequence, yet those who exemplify the teachings of Jesus and, as a result, are members of the kingdom of God are more important than him. The addition of λέγω ὑμῖν at the beginning of the statement of case heightens rhetorical emphasis, directing the narrative audience and the implied reader to afford special attention to the period. Further, the greater-to-lesser and lesser-to-greater argument is an often used Greco-Roman rhetorical device to provide *ecphrasis* and *synkrisis*.¹⁸

A rhetorical reading of the statement of case surfaces an enthymemic argument, one in which the narrative audience and implied reader must deduce (or “fill”) the minor premise. The enthymeme engenders dissonance on the part of the narrative audience and the implied reader in that – at least in terms of biological *logos* – all humans would be born of women. It thus raises the question of the derivation of those who belong to the kingdom of God. The only prior reference to the “kingdom of God” is found in 4.42-44, where the people of Capernaum seek to retain Jesus but are told that he must preach the “kingdom of God” to other cities in Galilee. The message

¹⁷The permutation of τήν ὁδόν to τήν ὁδόν σου falls into this realm of reasoning as well (cf. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 299).

¹⁸Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.23.4-2.23.5.

communicated by Jesus is one couched within the context of casting out unclean spirits and healing the disenfranchised. In terms of the third speech, this intratextual detail is available to the implied reader but not to the narrative audience. It helps demarcate the characteristics of those who belong to the kingdom of God – namely, personages who receive salvation from Jesus (those from the social and religious margin) – for the implied reader.

Identification of those who belong to the kingdom of God does not resolve the *origination* of those who belong to the kingdom of God, however. Analeptic linkage provides the answer: the implied reader draws upon previous instruction dispensed by John the Baptist in 3.8, where he informs the crowd that God is able to raise up “new” children (τεκνόν) for Abraham in response to their claim that they are the chosen children of Abraham. This is corroborated by the conclusion of the speech (7.35), whereby the narrative audience and implied reader identify “wisdom” – via intertextual repertoire – with the divine.¹⁹ The implied reader is thus able to fill the gap: those who belong to the “kingdom of God” originate from the divine.

Statement of Case: Dual Enthymemes (7.28)

<i>Conclusion:</i> John the Baptist is the greatest among those born of women (i.e., naturally) (7.28a).	<i>Conclusion:</i> Jesus is greater than John the Baptist, as he was born of the divine, not from a woman (i.e., naturally) (1.26-38; 3.21-22).
<i>Major Premise:</i> Members of the kingdom of God are greater than John the Baptist (7.28b).	<i>Major Premise:</i> Jesus is greater than John the Baptist.
<i>Minor Premise:</i> Members of the kingdom of God are born of the divine (3.8; 7.35).	<i>Minor Premise:</i> John the Baptist was born of a woman (7.28a).

¹⁹The association of the feminine “wisdom” with the divine is corroborated by multiple LXX texts (cf. Prov 8.1-9.6; Wis 7.22-30; Sir 24).

Also embedded within the statement of case is an enthymeme addressing the relationship of Jesus and John the Baptist, a deductive argument tethered to the preceding inquiry concerning Jesus' *ethos* (7.18-23). As Like the other enthymeme, the implied reader must go beyond the context of the speech in order to "fill" the missing minor premise. In this case, analeptic deductive activity to the scene depicting the foretelling of Jesus' birth in 1.26-38 and Jesus' baptism in 3.21-22 provides the implied reader with the data needed to complete the enthymemic argument. This information is not available to the narrative audience, however, with the result that the implied reader construes two enthymemes from the statement of case, whereas the narrative audience perceives only one. This divergence is one of many instances in the discourse where the implied reader possesses information not available to the characters and character groups within the narrative (one form of irony). In particular, construction of characterization occurs at this narrative level, as the implied reader is able to make judgements concerning the different characters and character groups contained therein.

3.3 Narrative Aside (7.29-30)

On that note, the implied author elects to employ a narrative aside in 7.29-30 in the midst of the speech, a rhetorical device intended to provide a direct means of instructing the implied reader regarding two character groups that normally appear as antagonists: the Pharisees and lawyers, and the tax collectors.²⁰ The narrative aside functions as an analeptic commentary on 3.1-18. The implied author could have provided the implied reader with this information in 3.1-18 but chose to withhold it

²⁰See chapter eight for an in-depth overview of the characterization of the Jewish people and leaders in Luke-Acts.

until this point in the narrative, with resulting rhetorical ramifications on the discourse – namely, heightening of its importance.²¹ Disclosure of the judgment from the narrator at this point in the narrative works to unite the ministries of Jesus and John the Baptist; both are inextricably related to the purpose of God, with the result being that those who jettison the baptism of John the Baptist reject the purpose of God. Withholding judgment on the character groups until this point in the narrative also gives the discourse greater validity in that the implied reader has “digested” several interactions between Jesus and the Pharisees and lawyers (i.e., *contra* 3.1-18, the first reference to both character groups, where no judgment – positive or negative – is given by the implied author). The narrative aside also plays an essential role in the rhetorical texture of the speech, as the dual enthymemes resulting from the statement of case (7.28) cannot be completed without the intratextual connection with the episode in 3.1-18.

3.4 Body of Argument (7.31-34)

The body of the speech (7.31-34) returns to the rhetorical style of the conclusion, posing a rhetorical question to the narrative audience. The subject matter of the query pertains to the *ethos* of a group to which the narrative audience belongs – namely, “people of this generation” – however, with their *ethos* standing in stark contrast with the *ethos* of John the Baptist as depicted in the three-fold inquiry regarding the *ethos* of John the Baptist. Inclusion of τίνι οὖν provides a transition from the statement of case to the actual body of the speech, while accentuating the magnitude of the ensuing argument. The texture of the body contains a number of

²¹See Sheeley, *Narrative Asides*, 114-15, 167, who argues that the implied author withholds the narrative judgment for rhetorical effect.

rhetical features. Foremost is the use of *synkrisis*, embodied in the repetitive of the comparative ὅμοιοι and ὁμοίω (vv.31-32).

“Members of this generation” serves as a generic reference to the people (λαός) – namely, the narrative audience. In the case of the implied reader, the referent indirectly extends to encompass potential disciples. Intertextual connotations also accompany the designation; its use in the LXX is frequently associative of a negative portrayal: a stiff-necked, rebellious people.²² The narrative audience, as well as the implied reader, thus expects a similar disposition via the ensuing comparison in v.32 and description of their reciprocal actions in vv.33-34. The comparative equivalent of “members of this generation” coincides with the “children” (παιδίον) in the marketplace; the disposition of the “members of this generation” thus parallels the activity of the children calling to one another to play games. Further, the comparative example is couched in the form of a popular rhyme,²³ resulting in a unique intertextual combination. The two periods of the rhyme coincide as simplistic enthymemes, with the result being that the “children” (παιδίον) want to play games but the other “children” (παιδίον) to whom they inquire decline to do so.

Rhyme as Enthymeme (7.32)

<i>Conclusion:</i> The other children (i.e., John and Jesus) did not dance when the children sitting in the marketplace piped.	<i>Conclusion:</i> The other children (i.e., John and Jesus) did not wail when the children sitting in the marketplace wept.
--	--

²²See, e.g., Exod 32.9; 33.3, 5; Deut 10.16. Association of “members of this generation” with negative connotations corresponds with intertextual interpretive use of “members of this generation” elsewhere in Luke-Acts – specifically Stephen’s speech in Acts 7.51-52. An alternative approach, as taken by Bovon (*Luke*, 285-86), does not account for the intratextual use of this LXX appellation and moreover the rhetorical discourse of the speech’s body elicits the narrative audience and implied reader to make this intertextual connection.

²³See Herodotus 1.141; Aesop *Fables* 27.

Major Premise: The children sitting in the marketplace piped and wanted the other children (i.e., John and Jesus) to dance.

Minor Premise: The other children (i.e., John and Jesus) did not want to dance when the children sitting in the marketplace piped.

Major Premise: The children in the marketplace wept and wanted the other children (i.e., John and Jesus) to weep.

Minor Premise: The other children (i.e., John and Jesus) did not want to weep when the children sitting in the marketplace wept.

The dispositions attributed to John the Baptist and Jesus brand both as deviant, individuals outside of the boundaries of acceptable social and religious discourse.²⁴ The parabolic imagery in vv.31-34 assumes legal language representative of the court setting.²⁵ Accordingly, this extratextual repertoire prompts the narrative audience and implied reader to exonerate the *ethos* of Jesus and John in the court of law and to envision the scribes and Pharisees as sitting and addressing each other as if in court. Use of derogatory rhetorical categorization is not foreign to Greco-Roman narrative, but rather is a common means of depicting opponents in a negative light. In both instances, the portrayal is a deductive interpretation of the *ethos* of each character, thus capturing elements of reality to convey veracity. Indeed, the accusation against Jesus is ironic, in that the implied reader – but not the narrative audience – knows that Jesus has formed friendships with tax collectors and sinners (in particular, Levi in 5.27-32; the Centurion in 7.1-10) – by offering to establish reciprocal patron-client relationships with them.

²⁴However cf. Wendy Cotter, “‘Yes, I Tell You, and More Than a Prophet’: The Function of John in Q,” in *Conflict and Invention*, 135-50, who argues that the *ethos* of John the Baptist, which is viewed favorably by the narrative audience and implied reader, serves to “protect” the *ethos* of Jesus.

²⁵See Wendy Cotter, “Parable of the Children in the Market Place, Q (Lk) 7:31-35: An Examination of the Parable’s Image and Significance,” *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987) 289-304.

The two periods describing the “caricatures” of John the Baptist and Jesus are juxtaposed in their rhetorical representations: John the Baptist is depicted as not eating (ἐσθίων) and not drinking (πίνων), whereas the “Son of Man” (i.e., Jesus) is portrayed as eating (ἐσθίων) and drinking (πίνων).²⁶ The narrative audience and implied reader attribute little truth to the claims as result of the rhetorical juxtaposition, viewing the interpretative conclusions as illogical. An inductive (allegorical) construal of the rhyme paints a vivid picture of the rhetorical argument:²⁷ John the Baptist and Jesus refuse to embrace the ideological – both sociological and religious – conventions

²⁶The interpretive judgment given to the *ethos* of a character or character group – whether in antiquity, modernity, or post-modernity – is subjective. Further, albeit the linkage between the implied author and implied reader places constraints on the actualization process, this does not necessitate that a real reader – whether one from antiquity or one today – will opt to embrace the ideological boundaries put forth. Hence, in the case of the “false” caricatures attributed to John the Baptist and Jesus, a real reader could opt to view both characters according to the false portrayal ascribed by their adversaries. This interpretative decision does not minimize the importance of the intertwined relationship that exists between the implied author and implied reader. Real readers who fail to account for such display an unethical disregard for the text, obviating the value of encountering the “textual” other by constructing a self-centered mirrored image of themselves.

²⁷The aversion to an allegorical reading of the rhyme and its relationship to John the Baptist and Jesus is predicated on modernistic sensitivities that have been overturned. On the contrary, an important component of Greco-Roman rhetorical argument involves that of induction, which encompasses allegory. Those that embrace the interpretative view espoused here include Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 3d (London: SCM Press, 1972) 160-62; D. A. Carson, “Matthew 11:19b/Luke 7:35: A Test Case for the Bearing of Q Christology on the Synoptic Problem,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994) 138-41; Olof Linton, “The Parable of the Children’s Game: Baptist and Son of Man (Matt xi, 16-19 = Luke vii, 31-35): A Synoptic Text-Critical, Structural, and Exegetical Investigation,” *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975-76) 159-79. Perhaps the most compelling reason in favor of an allegorical understanding is the rhetorical arrangement, that is, the enthymematic argument compels the narrative audience and implied reader to construe the discourse in an allegorical manner.

espoused by the “members of this generation” and, as a result, are labeled as individuals with dispositions that reside outside the realms of social acceptance.²⁸

3.5 Conclusion (7.35)

The conclusion of the speech (v.35) is in the form of an aphorism. Albeit somewhat laconic in construction, the conclusion exhibits skillful construction. Several observations can be made. First, the implied author employs a different word for “children” (τεκνόν) than previously used in the rhyme (παιδιόν), thereby avoiding association of the two designates by the narrative audience and the implied reader.²⁹ Second, though there is no prior intratextual use of “wisdom” (σοφία) in the narrative, equation of the divine with σοφία forms the basis of a rich intertextual repertoire for the implied reader.³⁰ Third, with that equivalent in the foreground, inclusion of the narrative aide earlier in the speech is given a heightened sense of importance via the conclusion – the rhetorical result being a chiasm united by the repetition of δικαιόω.

²⁸See Green (*Gospel of Luke*, 303-04) for a similar understanding.

²⁹Use of different words for the same subject for rhetorical and narrative purpose occurs elsewhere in New Testament narrative. See, e.g., the discussion in Spencer, “Narrative Echoes in John 21,” 60, involving the use of ἰχθύες for the cooked fish and ὀψάριον for the catch of fish in John 21.9-13. As such, while Jesus tells the disciples to bring him some of the fish (ἰχθύες) they had just caught (v.10), he feeds them the fish (ὀψάριον) he cooked on the charcoal fire (v.13). The accentuation of the cooked fish (ὀψάριον) induces the implied reader to identify Eucharistic connotations via intratextual linkage with John 6 – namely, the fish Jesus feeds the crowd and his disciples in John 6 is described by the narrator with the same word used in John 6 (i.e., ὀψάριον – vv.9, 11).

³⁰Representation of the divine with “wisdom” (σοφία) is evinced in a number of Jewish texts from antiquity (see, e.g., James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980] 168-76).

Tax collectors and all the people justify (ἐδικαίωσαν) God (v.29)

Wisdom is justified (ἐδικαιώθη) by her children (v.35)

The rhetorical result of the chiasm is that the justification afforded to the divine by those exhibiting faithfulness corroborates the *ethos* of John the Baptist and Jesus, both of whom are at the forefront of the speech (via the body).³¹ This presents an ironic twist for the implied reader, as those baptized by John assume a status greater than John himself. Finally, the rhetorical argument shifts from deduction and induction to abduction: the *topos* turns towards the divine (viz., σοφία).

The disparity between the narrative audience and the implied reader is brought to the forefront in the rhetorical argument of the conclusion: the implied reader, *contra* the narrative audience, is in a privileged reading position – privy to the information delineated in the narrative aside and thus able to construct and subsequently make sense of the chiasm in relationship to the narrative’s characterization. Based on the deductive argument of the chiasm, the implied reader ascertains that the children of God include the tax collectors and the people and exclude the Pharisees and the lawyers. The deductive argument also inseparably tethers together the baptism of John, the will of God, and vindication of God. In addition, while the narrative discourse concurrently closes (“fills”) several gaps, it remains open via the inclusion of the “people” as part of the children of God, as the precise faithfulness of that particular character group is ambiguous, frequently serving as a narrative ploy to move the plot

³¹For a slightly different interpretive approach to 7.35, cf. Simon Gathercole, “The Justification of Wisdom (Matt 11.19b/Luke 7.35),” *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003) 476-88, who concludes that the aorist δικαίω is best translated as “has been disassociated” and moreover the subject of τέκνον refers to those who reject Jesus and John the Baptist. The result is that the aphorism (“And Wisdom has been dissociated from her children”) stands as a bitter complaint from Jesus concerning the lack of a positive response to ministries of John the Baptist and himself.

along. This allows the implied author to present characters and character groups as the narrative progresses that exhibit varying degrees of faithfulness and coincide with the various taxonomies presented in the final speech of the Galilean ministry (8.4-18).

Certainly familiar with the story of the Israelite people in Exodus and Deuteronomy from which the intertextual echo “members of this generation” derives, the implied reader also recognizes that not all the Israelites were considered faithless. Further, via the intertextual echo, the implied reader understands that the Israelites’ journey of faith was ongoing. Construed within the context of the narrative discourse, the rhetorical texture of the third speech places Jesus and John the Baptist in continuity with the will of God and those opposed to them in contradistinction.

The episode featuring Jesus’ encounter with a woman of disrepute at the house of a Pharisee (7.36-50) exemplifies the rhetorical *topos* conveyed in the preceding speech. The social and religious qualities associated with tax collectors would also encompass those embodied by the woman who approaches Jesus; the result being that the implied author uses the episode to persuade the implied reader to regard the woman as a child of God. The representation of Simon, the Pharisee, is more nebulous and is not necessarily a mirror representation of the Pharisees and the lawyers identified in the prior narrative aside.³² While he certainly abrogates normal hospitality

³²The view embraced here operates on the premise that characterization in Luke-Acts is not always linear and moreover individuals or groups of a character group can extend beyond the boundaries delineated for that character group. See chapter nine for a more in-depth discussion. In the case of Simon, the Pharisee, *contra* the view of many in recent years that Simon is stereotypical of the Pharisaic attitude presented throughout the narrative (see, e.g., Darr, *Character Building*, 101-03; John T. Carroll, “Luke’s Portrayal of the Pharisees,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 [1988] 604-21), his characterization is open ended and likely embraces many of the concerns felt by the implied reader concerning the woman (see, e.g., Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 305-15; Robert C. Tannehill, “Should We Love Simon the Pharisee? Hermeneutical Reflections on the Pharisees in Luke,” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 21

protocol, which is fulfilled by the actions of the woman, he is not presented by the narrator as attempting to entrap Jesus in a premeditated plot (*contra* the Pharisees in the episodes contained in 5.17-26; 6.6-11). Indeed, his initial characterization is seemingly favorable, as he invites Jesus to his house for a banquet – perhaps on Jesus’ behalf – and acknowledges him as a religious teacher. Indeed, most scholars concur that the focus of the episode is not on Simon but rather on the woman and perhaps on whether the community will accept her as a member.³³ The question regarding the taxonomic characterization of Simon and the banquet guests is ultimately resolved by the fourth speech, which I will discuss in greater detail in chapters seven and nine.

4 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

The rhetorical texture of the third speech uses *ecphrasis* and *synkrisis* and focuses on bolstering the *ethos* of Jesus and John the Baptist. Various enthymemes – which require the implied reader to locate information in the preceding narrative in order to complete the argument – play an integral role in the construction of meaning. Specifically, the enthymematic argument prompts the narrative audience and implied reader to place Jesus and his followers in a superior position to that of John the Baptist

[1994] 424-33).

An additional element in favor of this argumentation is that the presence of the “lawyers” (οἱ νομικοί) results in the *carte blanche* negative categorization; the implied author places the blame for Jesus’ death on the priests and other authorities serving in the temple (not the Pharisees), which would have included “lawyers.” For this argument, see, e.g., Frank J. Matera, “The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985) 469-85; Joel B. Green, “The Death of Jesus,” in *Dictionary of Jesus*, 146-63.

³³The latter is corroborated by the closing narrative notation in 7.49 that turns the focus of the implied reader from the foibles of Simon to interior monologue of the whole in attendance.

and his followers. At the same time, the implied author employs several instances of irony – wherefore the implied reader possesses information not known by the narrative audience – that prompts the implied reader to make certain judgments regarding the narrative audience. An extratextual repertoire of LXX concepts is assumed by the implied author as *topoi* for rhetorical argument – namely, representation of the divine as “wisdom” and representation of the antagonists of Jesus and John the Baptists with “members of this generation.” This intertextual repertoire plays an important role in the overall rhetorical strategy of the speech, in terms of the comparison of Jesus and John the Baptist to Elisha and Elijah and moreover the completion of the enthymematic argument. In the end, like Elisha and Elijah, Jesus and John the Baptist do not comply with the ideological beliefs embraced by the “members of their generation,” but rather embody that which is commensurate with the divine will.

7

FOURTH GALILEAN SPEECH (LK 8.4-18): SOWING CHARACTER TAXONOMIES FOR THE IMPLIED READER

Jesus' fourth and final speech of the Galilean ministry falls within a section (8.1-56) comprised of a number of intertwined episodic encounters between Jesus and various characters seeking his divine power. It also marks a movement in the narrative towards greater emphasis on the involvement of the twelve disciples in Jesus' ministry. The final section of the Galilean ministry actually makes a further move in that direction, containing several episodes that focus on the faithfulness (or faithlessness) of the twelve disciples (9.1-46). A section that has received significant attention in recent years, 8.1-3, serves as a transition from the preceding section in 7.1-50 to the one in 8.1-56. It depicts the integral role women played in Jesus' inaugural ministry, a theme that continues throughout the rest of Luke and into Acts.¹ The discourse has been building on the presence of traveling companions, specifically with the twelve disciples – as of 6.12-16 – frequently appearing with Jesus. With 8.1-3 not only are women now

¹See, e.g., Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke and Acts* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994) esp. 72-76. In particular, for 8.1-3, see Ben Witherington III, "On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples – Luke 8:1-3," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979) 243-48; David Sim, "The Woman Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3," *Heythrop Journal* 30 (1989) 51-62.

accompanying Jesus, but they are fulfilling the role of patronage via their provision of financial support. The narrative momentum that 8.1-3 creates – namely, Jesus’ success continues to grow vis-à-vis his growing group of disciples – sets the stage for the fourth speech of the Galilean ministry. In particular, 8.1-3 serves as a narrative transition, helping to propel the narrative forward. This coincides with the use of transitions and summaries elsewhere in Luke-Acts.²

1 RHETORICAL SITUATION

The final speech (8.4-18) provides a taxonomic framework that the implied reader proleptically utilizes throughout the remainder of the narrative to assess characters and character groups. It also prompts the implied reader to analeptically evaluate characters and character groups from the prior narrative. Much already has been written on the rhetorical dimensions of the speech – at least as it occurs in Mark – by Mary Ann Tolbert, from which the ensuing discussion draws heavily.³ Up until this point in the narrative discourse the implied author has provided significant detail on the ideological systems and disposition of a disciple as well as those who display faithlessness. The basis for this is presented in the second speech (6.20-49), in which the implied author articulates various characteristics, coupled with resulting behaviors of those who belong to and participate in the kingdom of God. These *topoi* from the second speech provide a backdrop that the implied reader uses to determine the

²Cf. Lk. 1.5; 2.39-40, 52; 4.14-15; 4.42-44; 6.12-16; 9.51; 12.1; 17.11; 19.11, 28, 41; 20.1; 22.1, 39, 66; 23.44, 49-51; 24.1, 13; Acts 1.12-14; 2.43-47; 4.32-37; 5.12-16; 6.7; 8.4-8, 25; 9.31; 11.26b-30; 12.24-25; 15.36-16.10; 18.18-23; 19.20; 26.30-32; 28.30-31.

³*Sowing the Gospel*, 176-230; idem, “Mark Builds Characterization,” 347-57. However, despite the attention paid to the speech in its Markan form, rhetorical analysis of the Lukan version is largely non-existent.

corresponding faith of various characters and character groups encountered in the narrative.

The importance of “hearing” – which forms an integral component of the conclusion of the second speech (6.46-49) – carries over into the final speech (8.4-18), where it becomes an overarching rhetorical element.⁴ Regardless, while “hearing” connotes a favorable disposition towards discipleship in Luke-Acts, it does not result in one being automatically placed in the taxonomic category of true discipleship. The true test of discipleship is in the production of “fruit” (καρπός). All people are potential disciples and “hear” the message proclaimed; the decisive factor is the manner in which they respond: with actions consistent with the message broadcast by Jesus, or with misdirected attempts.⁵ The implied author, therefore, does not demarcate a decisive portrayal of the “people” (λαός) in the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts; rather, the characterization of the group remains open, thereby functioning as a rhetorical device by helping to move the plot along and pull the various narrative themes together.

The speech aims to persuade the audience regarding future events: the question as to how the disciples and the people will listen to the message of Jesus. It also employs significant components of *synkrisis*: the comparison of the various sowing

⁴See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 322-23, who identifies “hearing” as an integral theme in the speech. Derivations of ἀκούω occur in vv.8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21. The connection between “hearing” and Jesus’ message (the “word”) is noted by Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989) 349: “The key words “hear” (vv.8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21) and “word” (vv.11, 13, 15, 21) hold the passage together like glue.”

⁵Note the redaction-critical comments of Bovon (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 307) regarding the implications of “hearing” in the speech: “What concerns Luke is the *how* of hearing and no longer the *what*, as in Mark.”

activities and results with the exhibition of faith on the part of individuals. The largest audience thus far in the ministry of Jesus gathers to hear this speech per the narrative notation in v.4a. As such, the narrator not only indicates that the audience was a “great crowd” (ὄχλου πολλοῦ) – used to describe the audience attending the second speech in the Galilean speech (6.17b) – but includes the notation that the narrative audience came from every town (καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν), which serves to emphasize its enormity.

2 RHETORICAL TEXTURE

The actual parable serves as the introduction to the speech (8.5-8a), with Jesus’ response to the inquiry from the disciples regarding the meaning of the parable (8.8b-10) taking the form of the statement of case. Jesus’ corresponding explanation of the parable functions as the body of the speech (8.11-15) and the concluding parable as the conclusion (8.16-18). The implied author combines both inductive and deductive argumentation throughout the speech, using parabolic example as the former and various rhetorical devices as the latter.

2.1 Introduction (8.5-8a)

The example Jesus utilizes for the parable – introduction – is firmly rooted in agrarian culture, and the narrative audience would have been familiar with the activities he describes. Nonetheless, the implied reader – whose reading location likely derives from an urban environment – is not as well versed in the intricacies of agrarian society. As some scholars contend, this might explain the apparent profligate and haphazard planting technique employed and moreover the oversight of certain components of

planting and tilling processes.⁶ Notwithstanding, perhaps a better explanation for this apparent lack of care by the implied author is an attempt to focus the implied reader on the outcomes of sowing, rather than on the actual sowing processes. The rhetorical argument employed in the introduction certainly points in that direction. The four-fold repetition of the noun and verbal derivatives of “sow” (σπείρω, σπειρός) at the beginning of the introduction focus the attention of the narrative audience and the implied reader on the planting activity. The infinitival participle in v.5a establishes the foreground for the four ensuing examples as delineated by Jesus: a farmer planting a crop, with the ultimate objective being a bountiful harvest. The repetition of the relative pronoun (ἕτερος) to introduce the final three examples and the cadence in the sowing of the seed – via the repetition of the two derivative forms of “fell” (i.e., πίπτω, καταπίπτω)⁷ – serves to bring the introduction to a crescendo with the fourth example. Homocoteleuton in the form of four-fold repetition of the suffix -ήν as evinced by τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν also functions to distinguish the fourth instance from the previous three. Redactional emendation by the implied author – namely, deletion of ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν in Mark (parallel in Lk 8.6) – also helps ensure that the focus of the implied reader remains the actual outcome of the sowing process rather than the encumbrances that inhibit the production of fruit.

The aforementioned attention to repetition is offset by the use of four different prepositions to describe the consequence of the farmer’s sowing:

⁶See, e.g., Philip B. Payne, “The Order of Sowing and Ploughing in the Parable of the Sower,” *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978/79) 123-39.

⁷Keeping with good rhetorical style, the implied author avoids verbatim repetition (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.42.54).

some fell along the way (παρά) ...
some fell on the rock (ἐπί) ...
some fell in the midst of (ἐν μέσῳ) ...
some fell into (εἰς) ...

The primary difference in the four prepositions is in regard to the penetration and maturation of the seed; the first three do not reach the point of bearing fruit, *contra* the fourth example, where the seed finds its way into the soil to produce a substantial crop.⁸ Hence, the distinguishing characteristic of the “good soil” – versus the soil on the path, rocky soil, or soil full of thorns – is twofold: the seed penetrates the surface and undergoes a period of maturation and growth, with the outcome being a bountiful harvest.⁹ Further, the types of soil are not in the purview of the implied author in that the hazards presented are not solely indicative of the soil type with which they are associated; “good” soil is only recognized when its fruitfulness becomes evident.¹⁰

Intrusion of the narrator at the end of the introduction (v.8a), coupled with the nature of Jesus’ proclamation, signals to the implied reader that the “speech” is simply a parabolic example and has reached an apparent conclusion. Jesus’ exclamation (v.8b)

⁸A redactional analysis of the discourse of the statement of case evinces only a handful of discrepancies between the Lukan and Markan discourses. One of note is the exclusion of the notation in the third parabolic example (Lk 8.7 and Mark 4.7) that the seed produced no fruit (καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν – Mark 4.7) by the Lukan implied author. The likely reason for the omission is connected to the focus on “fruit” (καρπός) as the objective of the sowing activity in the narrative discourse. Inclusion of this notation in the case of the third sowing example would stifle the rhetorical impact of the fourth example (Lk 4.8), whereby the production of “fruit” is given cumulative emphasis.

⁹See Charles W. Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994) 172-74, who posits that the *harvest* is the focus of the parable, not the *types of soil*. He also details that the threats as well as the anticipation of comparable harvests by Jesus in the parable are commonplace in Greco-Roman antiquity and thus formed an integral element of the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader.

¹⁰As noted by Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 325.

– “the one who has ears to hear (ἀκούειν), let that one hear (ἀκουέτω)” – serves as an intratextual echo for the implied reader (and possibly the narrative audience); specifically, the reference to “hearing” (ἀκούω) in v.8a links the introduction with the end of the second speech (6.46-49), where “hearing” (ἀκούω) serves as the central *topos* (viz., true disciples “hear” versus false disciples who do not “hear”). Such intertwines the disposition and behavior of a disciple, as delineated in the second Galilean speech, with the assimilation and enactment of Jesus’ message. This intratextual connection is given added emphasis through the narrative marker ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει, likely prompting the performer to shout out ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω in a loud voice while pointing to her or his ears.¹¹ Appropriate “hearing” means that a disciple will articulate a disposition and accompanying behaviors that are commensurate with Jesus’ message.

2.2 Statement of Case (8.9-10)

The precise identity of the “disciples” who approach Jesus in v.9 is ambiguous; “disciples” thus far in the narrative simply represent those who associate themselves with Jesus by accompanying him in his ministerial encounters. A change in narrative audience for the statement of case and the remainder of the speech is not evinced by the discourse; the identity of the character distinction “disciples” is open; the implied author leaves this narrative element open, a “gap” the implied reader must fill. This is of particular relevance in that the language of the statement of case confronts the narrative audience and the implied reader with insider-outsider categories. Exclusion of

¹¹For a discussion of narrative markers associated with delivery, see Nadeau, “Delivery in Ancient Times,” 53-60; Olbricht, “Delivery and Memory,” 159-67; Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel*, 77-101, 127-42.

the larger audience assembled to listen to Jesus' speech (8.5) is not indicated by the narrator (viz, the remainder of the speech serves as private instruction to a select group). Likewise, presentation of Jesus answering questions posed by disciples and others within the hearing of a larger audience occurs elsewhere in the narrative.¹²

Use of the perfect passive δέδοται in the statement of case serves as a discourse marker, highlighting Jesus' ensuing words as of particular importance to the implied reader.¹³ The open-ended characterization of "disciples" plays an important role in helping the narrative audience and the implied reader interpret the statement of case within the intratextual context. Though the occurrence of "mystery" (μυστήριον) is a *hapax legomenon* for Luke-Acts, the *topos* of the divine purpose being hidden and then disclosed is not novel to the corpus of Luke-Acts nor via the intertextual repertoire of the narrative audience and the implied reader.¹⁴ Substantiation for Jesus' insider-outsider claim is provided via the intertextual echo with Isa 6.9-10 in v. 10. In short, integral to a disciple's production of a "bountiful harvest" is interpretation, as denoted via the intertextual use (as part of the citation from Isa 6.9-10) of συνίζω. Indeed, importance of "interpretation" – whether by the implied author, narrative audience, or implied reader – spans all the way back to the prologue (1.4); the aim to interpret more accurately the events of Jesus' ministry and that of the early Christian

¹²See, e.g., Lk 6.20, 12.1, 16.1.

¹³Use of the perfect verbal tense typically serves as a rhetorical marker, an indication to the listener and reader that the ensuing material is of particular importance (see Porter, *Idioms*, 20-23).

¹⁴Cf. Dan 2.18-19, 27-30, 47; Wis 2.22; 6.22. For elaboration, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, vol. 1, 5th ed. (Anchor Bible, 28; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1981) 1:708; John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (Society of New Testament Supplement Manuscript Series, 76; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 30-31; Green, *Theology of the Gospel*, 23-42.

community.¹⁵ This *topos* is echoed as the narrative discourse progresses, emphasizing that understanding of Jesus' message (that which is "heard") cannot occur without interpretation. The message Jesus conveys to his audience and that which the implied author delimits to the implied reader is that the production of a "bountiful harvest" by a disciple does not result without interpretation; "hearing" is simply the initial act in the journey of discipleship.¹⁶ In addition, to take it one step further, Jesus' message is understandable for those able to interpret it, whereas it remains a "mystery" for those who are not able to interpret it. Likewise, construction of meaning surrounding the "kingdom of God" continues to progress; here the implied reader reaches the understanding that the "kingdom of God" is a reality to which one cannot belong unless correct interpretation occurs, interpretation with a resulting disposition and behavior (as delineated in earlier discourse – especially the second speech in 6.20-49).¹⁷

2.3 Body of Argument (8.11-15)

The argument of the speech's body (vv. 11-15) closely mirrors the categories put forth in the introduction and actually replicates much of the language therein, following the four sowing activities detailed earlier. The descriptive interpretation that

¹⁵This *topos* continues throughout the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts (cf. Lk 24.45; Acts 8.26-40). For the importance of interpretation as related to the oral/aural processing in Greco-Roman antiquity, see, e.g., F. Gerald Downing, *Doing Things with Words in the First Christian Century* (Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series, 200; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

¹⁶See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 326-27, for a similar approach.

¹⁷The permanent separation of those who fail to interpret Jesus' message is diluted by the implied author of Luke, in that the last clause of the intertextual citation from LXX Isa 6.10 that is included in Mark (4.12c) – μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς – is excluded in Luke (8.10).

Jesus puts forth functions to bolster the aphoristic claim of the speech's statement of case. The rhetorical style of the body also replicates certain rhetorical features from the introduction – specifically, the conjunction and article (οἱ δέ for the first two and τό δέ for the latter two) followed by the preposition used in the introduction to describe each sowing activity.¹⁸ Further rhetorical emphasis results in the parallel construction of the four periods: the four-fold repetition of the participle (οἱ ἀκούσαντες) preceded by the plural demonstrative pronoun οὗτοι. Deviation from this framework, in contradistinction to those who claim the implied author displays poor rhetorical style, heightens the impact of the discourse: the seed that fails to initiate growth receives no designation (i.e., the demonstrative pronoun οὗτοι is not employed in the first example [v.12]).

Before embarking on providing a more direct answer to the inquiry from the disciples, the speech situates the response within an interpretative framework by identifying that which was being sown as the “word of God.” As such, the discourse, with the implied reader construing Jesus’ message with the “word of God,” grounds it within the historical tradition of Israel’s past; this intertextual connection serves to authenticate Jesus’ message.¹⁹

Like the argument of the introduction, the argument of the body does not focus on the types of soil but on the outcomes of sowing. Albeit the resultant outcomes essentially break into three “growth” interpretive classifications – (1) no growth, (2)

¹⁸The only exception would be the preposition employed for the third example, as εἰς is changed to ἐν μέσῳ. This modification by the implied author can be attributed to rhetorical style, in that verbatim repetition is something to be avoided in good rhetoric.

¹⁹Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 327.

some growth but no fruit, (3) sustained growth bearing fruit²⁰ – the center of the argumentation is on the descriptive growth (or lack thereof) activity. The result is four taxonomic categories from which the implied reader constructs – analeptically and proleptically – characterization. Repetition of verbal derivations of ἀκούω – a participial form in the case of the first, third, and fourth examples and action verb in the case of the second – ties together the rhetorical argumentation and moreover continues to keep hearing at the forefront of the discourse. This rhetorical maneuvering steers the narrative audience and the implied reader to the understanding that while Jesus’ message is broadcast to a large audience, the decisive factor is in regard to the response.²¹

Lukan emphasis on the sequential maturation of faith is evident in the redactional activity of the implied author. This is manifest vis-à-vis several aspects of the narrative discourse. First, the urgency of the narrative discourse in Mark is downplayed through the omission of the adjective εὐθύς by the Lukan implied author (Mark 4.15; cf. Lk 8.12). Second, concentration on producing fruit – that is, the ongoing display of a disposition and behavior representative of a disciple – is apparent in the discourse of Luke rather than the actual outcome (viz., the exclusion of the specific measure of harvest reaped), as is the case in the Markan discourse (“thirtyfold and sixtyfold and a hundredfold” in Mark 4.20 versus Lk 8.15). Third, the addition of ἐν ὑπομονῇ by the Lukan implied author (Lk 8.15 versus Mark 4.20) further accentuates the ongoing nature of discipleship (versus that in the Markan discourse).

²⁰See I. Howard Marshall, “Tradition and Theology in Luke (Luke 8:5-15),” *Tyndale Bulletin* 20 (1969) 74, for this observation.

²¹“Growth” is linked to the maturation and sustenance of faithfulness (see, e.g., Marshall, “Luke 8:8-15,” 56-75).

Fourth, the implied author amends apocalyptic terminology (θλίψις and διωγμός in Mark 4.17) to terminology with ethical connotations (πειρασμός in Lk 8.13).²² Finally, the Lukan implied author redacts ἄκαρπος γίνεται to τελεσφοροῦσιν (Mark 4.19; cf. Lk 8.14), thus giving the discourse a teleological emphasis.²³

2.3.1 First Example: Sowing Along the Path

The first example (v.12) places the cause for the inability of the disciples to “hear” on the devil (διάβολος), a designation that culls intratextual allusions for the implied reader to the earlier temptation episode (4.1-11). The connotation of this connection for the implied reader is that the struggle between the divine representatives of good and evil extends to that of the human realm. Yet, though the “potential” disciples in the case of the first example are lured away by the devil, the implied reader simultaneously knows that Jesus withstood a temptation of great magnitude, and thus such can be overcome with divine guidance. A metaphorical connection between the devil and the “birds of the air” (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) in the earlier parabolic rendition of the first example is heightened by likely intertextual connotations, where “birds of the air” represent the devil.²⁴ Referential linkage to the interpretative framework established in the initial period of the body occurs via Jesus’ notation that the failure to produce a harvest is due to the “word” (λογός) being taken from the hearts of the potential disciples. In addition, the latter places the maturation of

²²See Bovon (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 309-10) for this observation.

²³For other redactional refinements of Mark by the implied author of Luke, see Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 303-15.

²⁴Metaphorical representation of the “devil” as “birds of the air” likely was part of the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader and the narrative audience (cf. Jub 11.11; Apoc Abr 13.3-7; 1 Enoch 90.8-13).

faith at the core of the disciple: the heart. The cause for the inability of the disciples to hear is identified as failure to believe – the initial mode of discipleship. The resulting consequences of not “hearing” appropriately and “believing” is contained in the ἵνα + subjunctive clause at the end of the period: salvation does not come to those personages.²⁵ The ongoing nature of the “disbelief” is conveyed by the use of the present tense rather than the aorist tense for the participle (πιστεύσαντες).

2.3.2 *Second Example: Sowing on the Rock*

Intratextual connectivity with the earlier temptation episode (4.1-13) continues in the second example (v.13) with the reference to “temptation” (πειρασμός). While this scene is not privy to the narrative audience, it is in the foreground of the implied reader. Actualization of this intratextual nexus engenders several images. First, disciples can fall prey to the “temptation” of the devil even though Jesus overcame “temptation” earlier. Second, disciples can draw on Jesus’ earlier triumph as an exemplar when encountering “temptation from the devil.” Finally, perhaps, since the disciples represented in this example are unable to overcome “temptation” from the devil, *contra* Jesus earlier in the narrative, the disciples portrayed herein lack the faith and disposition of Jesus.

In addition to the analeptic intratextuality involving the use of “temptation” (πειρασμός), the second sowing example provides the implied reader with a proleptic referent to the scene at the Mount of Olives in Lk 22.39-46, where πειρασμός forms an *inclusio*; the scene begins and ends with Jesus instructing the disciples to pray that

²⁵The aim of the implied author comes into view here, as the ἵνα + subjunctive result clause is a redactional addition. Reason for this redaction likely is tied to the integral role of “salvation” in the plot of the narrative discourse.

they not to fall into temptation (πειρασμός).²⁶ Through retrospective actualization, the implied reader concludes that failure to pray gives rise to succumbing to temptation. Building further coherence, the implied reader also pinpoints connections – through the combination of both προσευχή (“prayer”) and πειρασμός (“temptation”) – with Jesus’ instructions regarding prayer in Lk 11.1-13. In particular, Jesus’ question to the disciples preceding his admonition to them at the close of the Mount of Olives scene (τί καθεύδετε in 22.46b) evinces imagery with the parabolic example in Lk 11.5-13 in that the narrative implies that the friend and his family are “sleeping” and had to be awakened (“at night” [v.5]; “my children are with me in bed” [v.7]).²⁷ Linkage with the “Lord’s” Prayer” in Lk 11.2-4, which is intertwined with the parabolic example in Lk 11.5-13, directs the implied reader to construe prayer (viz., the “Lord’s Prayer”) as the means of thwarting temptation. The implied reader, through this intratextual maneuvering, in addition to identifying the content of the “Lord’s Prayer” (11.1-4) as comprising the core subject matter for the prayer of disciples, adumbrates the parameters of temptation: the need to embrace the realized eschatological presence of the kingdom of God, which, in the case of Luke-Acts and within the contextual boundaries of Lk 11.1-13, concerns issues of non-reciprocal benefaction and friendship without the constraints of honor and shame.²⁸

²⁶“Pray that you not enter into temptation (πειρασμός)” in 23.40 and “rise and pray that you may not enter into temptation (πειρασμός)” in 23.46. I am grateful to Dr. Stephen C. Barton for pointing this connection out to me.

²⁷The mirroring of ἀναστάς in 11.8 to describe what the friend must do in order to enact the benefaction his friend is seeking with Jesus’ admonition to the disciples to “arise” (ἀναστάντες) in 22.46 creates an additional intertextual allusion between the two scenes.

²⁸For a discussion of honor and shame protocols in Lk 11.1-13, see Herman C. Waetjen, “The Subversion of ‘World’ by the Parable of the Friend at Midnight,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001) 703-21.

Unlike the seed in the first example, the seed in the second example progresses; it actually begins to grow. The failure occurs in that it does not establish a root system from which to sustain ongoing growth. Rhetorical demarcation of the period of initial growth and that of shriveling occurs vis-à-vis the repetition of *καίρως* (“time”), a temporal marker indicative of rhetorical ramifications in both ancient and modern discourse.

2.3.3 *Third Example: Sowing Among the Thorns*

Progression in growth and maturation continues with the third example; the seed produces fruit, but it does not mature.²⁹ Rhythmic repetition of the conjunction *καί* delivers rhetorical suspense to the discourse: elongation of the teleological result of the seed’s growth. The style of the period sets it apart from the previous two examples and the subsequent example; the rhetorical effect caused by the extended ending of the period builds suspense in the discourse. The redactional inclusion of *ἀδονέω* by the implied author represents an emphasis of the Lukan discourse on faith as a sequential process. The addition of *ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου* (“pleasures of life”) to the list of reasons impeding growth coincides with the Lukan *topos* that emphasizes the importance of using possessions and wealth (and power) to enact non-reciprocal benefaction (per the second speech in 6.20-49), while concurrently posing how possessions and wealth are potential obstacles to discipleship (viz., in the reluctance to embrace the new mode of benefaction espoused by the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts).

²⁹A redactional analysis of Lk 8.7, 14 and Mark 4.7, 18-19 corroborates the Lukan interest in faith as a maturation process: the process in Luke emphasizes the need for ripening (*τελεσφορέω*), whereas Mark is focused on the end result (*ἄκαρπος γινέται*). See Bovon (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 310) for a similar observation.

2.3.4 Fourth Example: Sowing into Good Soil

Those represented by “good soil” exhibit authentic hearing that leads to actions commensurate with the message communicated by Jesus. Continuation of the emphasis on faith as a progressive maturation process by the implied author is evident in several ways. First, the implied author inserts ἐν ὑπομονῇ at the very end of the parabolic example (in contrast to Mark 4.20); the implied reader thus concludes that those disciples who produce fruit do so over an extended period of time, often faced by some of the same adversities that confronted those in the preceding three examples.³⁰ Second, the implied author changes the Markan παραδέχονται to κατέχουσιν (Mark 4.20). The rhetorical result is that the latter connotes ongoing action versus the immediate decision demanded by the former. On a similar and related note, the redactional addition that disciples represented by the “good soil” reflect upon Jesus’ message in their hearts, coupled with the rhetorical adjectival duplicate of καλός and ἀγαθός, has a similar rhetorical effect.³¹ Finally, the implied author eliminates the reference to the bountiful harvest “hundredfold” (as noted in the fourth sowing

³⁰Note the observation of Bovon (*Luke 1:1-9:50*, 311): “But this evangelist always favors the anthropological side; thus the continuous responsibility of human beings (8:15) plays the main role (ὑπομονή is not only passive patience, but perseverance). This consists in loyalty to the divine transmission of the christological word (ἀκούω, ‘to listen,’ and κατέχω ‘to hold fast’) and in bearing of fruit (καρποφορέω, ‘to bear fruit’), which is understood in an ethical sense.”

³¹The use of καλῇ as an adjectival descriptive of the heart of the disciple forms a rhetorical link for the narrative audience and the implied reader (i.e., the adjectival descriptive for the “soil” in the fourth sowing activity [v.8a] is καλῇ). In addition, the duplicate adjectival description induces a rhetorical effect; the nature of a disciple’s “heart” is accentuated. Actual placement of the dative preposition – ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ – prior to the verb κατέχουσιν, which is the opposite of the construction of similar phrases in Luke-Acts, likely heightens the attention of the narrative audience and implied author on the nature of the disciples’ hearts.

example of the introduction [v.8a]) – in contrast to Mark (4.20) – thus focusing the discourse on the creation of fruit – *contra* the results depicted in the three previous examples.

2.4 Conclusion (8.16-18)

The discourse in Luke diverges from that in Mark in that the “Parable of Sowing” is followed by only one of the series of parables that comprise the Markan parabolic discourse (4.1-34). This shift in rhetorical arrangement demonstrates attentiveness by the implied author to the importance of speeches as vehicles for demarcating narrative plot and characterization. Retention of metaphoric agrarian language continues in the conclusion (8.16-18). Notwithstanding, the metaphorical change in the conclusion evinces a rhetorical effect;³² the narrative audience and the implied reader are prompted to embark upon a deductive activity of relating the connotations of the conclusion with the preceding rhetorical pieces of the speech. In addition, the conclusion is replete with rhetorical stylistic features, including several instances of repetition and wordplay. This also contributes to the heightened discourse and the ensuing effects on the narrative audience and the implied reader.

Both metaphors exhibit enthymematic argument, thereby prompting the narrative audience and the implied reader to embark on a deductive journey. In both instances, the narrative audience and the implied reader are prodded to actively engage the discourse.

³²*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.34; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 8.6.4-8.6.8; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.2.

Enthymeme #1 (v.16)

Conclusion: No one who wants those entering a house to see places a lamp underneath a vessel or places it under a bed.

Major Premise: Those who light a lamp place it on a stand so that those entering the house can see.

Minor Premise: Without a lighted lamp, or to hide and conceal at least one correctly positioned within the house, it is impossible to see.

Enthymeme #2 (v.17)

Conclusion: It is impossible to keep that which is hidden concealed and that which is a secret undisclosed when light is present.

Major Premise: Light reveals those things hidden and secret.

Minor Premise: Without light, it is possible

The deductive relationship between the two enthymemes leads the narrative audience and the implied reader to the incontrovertible conclusion that those who listen to the message of Jesus exhibit actions indicative of authentic hearing. The parallel understanding is that those who hear the message of Jesus manifest authentic hearing and, in doing so, appropriate behavior (and thus maturation leading to the production of “fruit”).

Pleonasm serves an important rhetorical function. This is manifest in several different ways. To begin, wordplay between *λυχνός* (“light”) and *λυχνία* (“stand”), both of which are very similar in sound, links together the various components of the argument in the first enthymeme (v.16). *Synkrisis* of covering the light emitted by the lamp versus that of placing it on a stand so that its light illuminates the room in which it is contained addresses the contrast between the two actions (v.16). The absurdity of covering a lamp in the room of a house,³³ thus preventing its light from illuminating the expanses of the room, is corroborated by the second enthymeme (v.17); the deductive conclusion by the narrative audience and the implied reader is that it is impossible to

³³The precise meaning of “covering” the light or “putting it underneath the bed” is unclear (see Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 313, for the possible interpretations).

conceal the light of a lamp and, in the case of the disciple whose disposition and actions coincide with the fourth sowing example from the speech's body (v. 15), it is incomprehensible for those who authentically hear the message of Jesus to enact anything but representative behavior. Second, the use of *φανερός* in both enthymemes serves to tie the rhetorical argument together, moving the narrative audience and the implied reader to the understanding that the argument of the second enthymeme pertains to that of the first; the resulting conclusion is that authentic hearing evinces befitting behavior. The corollary is that unauthentic hearing results in unfitting behavior. Similarly, duplicate use of *φανερός* in the second enthymeme provides rhetorical emphasis, bringing illumination, as made possible by the light, into the forefront of the discourse. Finally, close correspondence between the two metaphors in the second enthymeme – *κρυπτόν* ("hid") and *ἀπόκρυφον* ("secret") – engenders connectivity as well as heightens the relevance of connotations conjured by the metaphors.

The narrative discourse brings together the conclusion and the statement of case through intratextual repetition – the result being both a heightened rhetorical emphasis on the *narratio* as the focus of the narrative audience and a prodding of the implied reader to return to the earlier statements contained within the speech. Both of these are evident in several ways. The first metaphorical enthymeme (8. 16b) employs *βλέπω* – an intertext of Isa 6.9 (in 8.9c) – to describe the "enabling" activity of those entering the house. The *topos* of understanding extends to the conclusion (i.e., in the use of *γινώσκω* in 8.9a and 8.17b); authentic hearing results in that which is hidden becoming comprehensible. Additional emphasis on the rhetorical impact of the intratextual connection occurs in the use of the double negative (v. 17a: "For there is

nothing [οὐ] hidden that shall not [οὐ] be made known”). Actualization of this intratextual connection by the narrative audience and the implied reader is that the “secrets of the kingdom of God” are to be equated with the “fruit” produced by the “good soil.”

The ongoing *topos* of authentic and inauthentic hearing receives its rhetorical culmination in the final metaphor of the conclusion (8.18). It contains, in particular, a number of elements that heighten its rhetorical impact. Foremost is enthymematic arrangement – based on contraries³⁴ – that guides the narrative audience and the implied reader to a deductive conclusion: those who embody authentic hearing will receive more, whereas those who fail to hear in an authentic manner lose that which has been received. Second, the use of αἶρω prompts the narrative audience and the implied reader to recollect the metaphorical symbolism of the devil “taking away” the seed from the first soil example (v.12); hence, the devil is seen as the subject of the passive form in the conclusion. Third, intratextual connection with the statement of case – in the form of repetition, including ἀκούω and βλέπω – provides the implied reader with information needed to fill a gap left in the narrative discourse: the identity of that which is given to those who hear with authenticity and that which is taken away from those who fail to do so. The deductive conclusion for the implied reader is “the kingdom of God” – continued growth in disposition and behavior befitting of the message delivered and enacted by Jesus. Finally, use of δοκέω demarcates between “hearing” that is genuine versus that which simply appears to be genuine. Some

³⁴For a discussion of enthymemic argument, as based on contraries, in the New Testament, see Paul A. Hollaway, “The Enthymeme as an Element of Style in Paul,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001) 329-42.

hearing may merely be short term in that it does not yield any fruit but rather fails to mature, as is the case with the second and third sowing examples.³⁵

Conclusion: A careful hearing of Jesus' message is important, for appropriate or inappropriate behavior and disposition result.

Positive Premise: Those who hear (and understand) Jesus' message will increasingly embody the disposition and behavior delineated therein.

Negative Premise: Those who do not hear (do not understand) Jesus' message will increasingly fail to embody the disposition and behavior delineated therein.

2.5 *Inclusio:* 8.1-3 and 8.19-20

The subsequent episodic narrative encounter in 8.19-20 functions as an *inclusio* with the narrative preceding the speech in 8.1-3. In 8.1-3, a group of women are depicted as serving as patrons to Jesus and his followers. Thus far in the narrative discourse, the implied author has not portrayed Jesus' family as exemplary disciples (or followers). This enables the implied author to use their entry into the narrative for a rhetorical purpose, a means for further elaborating on the nature and meaning of patronage and kinship.³⁶ This depiction is given meaning in the reply Jesus issues, which employs two verbs endowed with intratextual connotations. The first verb, ἀκούω, ties the episode to the final Galilean speech (8.4-18), in which, as just discussed, authentic hearing is the pivotal *topos*. The second verb, ποιέω, posits a connection with the second speech and, in particular, its conclusion (6.46-49).

Compilation of these various connections moves the narrative audience and the implied

³⁵See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 329-30, who makes a similar point in the use of δοκέω.

³⁶Jesus' family seeking him could be construed by the narrative audience and the implied reader as an endeavor to implore patronage from him. If that is the case, then their characterization at this juncture of the narrative discourse is ambivalent to negative and the implied reader associates them with the third sowing taxonomy.

reader to the understanding that the women in 8.1-3 embody the characteristics of exemplary disciples. Movement towards an acceptance of kinship that is *contra* traditional first century CE Greco-Roman cultural systems is begun here as well, a *topos* that receives more elaboration as the narrative progresses, whereby physical descent is no longer a demarcation but rather authentic hearing that results in action.³⁷

3 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

Rhetorical texture of the final speech of Jesus in the Galilean ministry forms an interpretive grid from which the implied reader construes characterization throughout Luke-Acts. The rhetorical argument focuses the narrative discourse on action (production of “fruit”) versus soil types, something that becomes even more obvious to a real reader via redactional analysis. As I will demonstrate in greater detail in chapter nine, characterization for the implied reader coincides with the actions of sowing rather than the qualities of soil (*contra* Mark). The implied reader – both analeptically and proleptically – associates characters and character groups with one of the four sowing activities. In particular, the implied author uses enthymematic argument in the conclusion to prompt the implied reader to make deductive conclusions regarding preceding instructions on discipleship (especially those from the second speech in 6.20-49) and the actions of disciples who exhibit (or fail to exhibit) characteristics of the fourth sowing example. The focus of the speech – through its rhetorical argument – falls upon the fourth sowing example. Authentic discipleship – namely, the fourth

³⁷See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 330, for a similar view. Also, cf. Stephen C. Barton, *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew* (Society for New Testament Monograph Series, 80; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), who reaches a similar understanding regarding Mark and Matthew.

sowing example – requires persistence (action that occurs over an extended period of time), and, through the use of the intertextual connection to Isa 6.9-10 in 8.9-10, the implied reader concludes such is tethered to correct interpretation.

PART THREE:
NARRATIVE TRAJECTORIES AND HERMENEUTICAL APPROPRIATION
BY AUTHORIAL READERS

8

DISPUTED ISSUES: THE UNITY OF LUKE-ACTS AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The previous four chapters provide a foundation on which to build an understanding of narrative trajectories in Luke-Acts. Not unlike speeches in ancient narrative, the four speeches propel the narrative discourse forward, serving as the driving impetus for the implied reader's narrative construction. By the time the implied reader reaches the commencement of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (Lk 9.51), the implied author has demarcated the basis of Jesus' *ethos* through *logos* and even *pathos*. Indeed, the narrative discourse not only establishes Jesus' *ethos* but the *ethos* of those who assume the obligations of discipleship.

Two "prickly" issues have been a "thorn in the side" of Lukan scholarship for the past two decades: the question concerning the unity of the two works, and the representation of the Jewish people in the narrative discourse. In order to provide an adequate analysis of how the implied reader constructs plot, characterization, and *topoi* from the overarching narrative discourse of Luke-Acts based on the rhetorical texture of Jesus' four Galilean speeches, some resolution of both issues is required. For example, it would be methodologically specious to adumbrate narrative trajectories that span both Luke and Acts if a significant degree of dissonance is envisioned between the two. I shall argue below, however, that there is considerable narrative,

generic, and theological overlap between the two volumes, despite the ostensible differences, with the resulting conclusion that Acts should be viewed as the sequel to Luke.

Likewise, questions as to whether the Jewish people are painted in an entirely negative light or in an ambiguous manner and whether future hope for redemption is still a possibility with the closure of the narrative affect the overall construal of plot and characterization and, to a lesser extent, *topoi*. A majority of the investigative approaches to the Jewish people in Luke-Acts envision them as a monolithic entity. I shall argue below, however, that this methodological starting point obscures certain features of the narrative discourse. Accordingly, my ensuing analysis will show that the Jewish people cannot be classified as a monolithic entity but rather represent several different individual character taxonomies.¹ Further, the reading (and listening) process is progressive as well as retrospective; construction of characterization thereby allows for the reevaluation of the Jewish characters and character groups – despite preceding stereotypes in the narrative.

1 LUKE-ACTS: COHERENT OR INCOHERENT (DIS)UNITY

In 1927 Henry Cadbury put forward a cogent argument in favor of viewing Acts as the second volume in a two-work sequel on literary and stylistic grounds.² The

¹Extensive debate on characterization in Greco-Roman literature and more specifically characterization in Luke-Acts is addressed in chapter two. In short, the debate centers on two interrelated issues: first, whether or not character groups are constructed in an absolute, concretized fashion; second, whether or not individual characters or groups of characters can extend beyond the portrayal of the character group from which they derive. My view is that Greco-Roman characterization, coupled with axiomatic dictates of how narrative discourse is actualized, is not completely linear – rigidly confined to an established parameter. Rather, the *ethos* of individual characters or even groups of characters moves beyond the borders defined from which the implied reader attributes meaning.

²*The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: McMillan Publishing Company, 1927).

unity of Luke-Acts as a single corpus, as a result, was largely the consensus of the scholarly community until the past decade and a half. This has been challenged by several scholars on the grounds of generic, narrative, theological, and stylistic incoherence; they conclude that the *hyphen* Cadbury inserted in Luke-Acts should be removed. The initial challenge to the unity of Luke-Acts was by Richard Pervo in 1987, who argues that Acts employs the generic conventions of the ancient novel.³ Stylistic peculiarities led James M. Dawsey to question the validity of claiming narrative unity.⁴ Shortly thereafter, Pervo teamed with Mikael C. Parsons in a monograph to dispute the unity of Luke-Acts from the perspectives of genre, narrative, and theology.⁵ As the relevance of the four speeches of Jesus in the Lukan Galilee ministry to the narrative discourse of Acts is tethered to the unity of Luke-Acts, it is important to understand the issues around why Acts should be considered as a sequel to Luke. In the following section I will overview the arguments posited against the unity of Luke-Acts and subsequently cover the reasons why the position in favor of unity is more compelling.

³*Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

⁴“The Literary Unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of Style – A Task for Literary Critics,” *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989) 48-66.

⁵*Rethinking*. The monograph, in addition to Pervo’s dissertation, was preceded by Parson’s “The Unity of the Lukan Writings: Rethinking the *Opinio Communis*,” in *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr.*, ed. Raymond H. Keathley (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1990) 29-53 and Pervo’s “Must Luke and Acts be Treated as One Genre?” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 306-17.

1.1 Incoherence Leads to the View of Disunity

There is a prodigious amount of scholarly investigation over the past twenty-five years surrounding the genre of Luke and Acts. Cadbury only dealt briefly with the question of genre, concluding – after comparing the potential merits of biography, historiography, and other genre types – that Luke-Acts is more like historiography than any other genre.⁶ Recent genre classification loosely breaks into four Greco-Roman categories: biography, history, epic, or novel. Those who argue against the unity of Luke-Acts envision Acts as coinciding most closely with the traits of the ancient novel and locate Luke in the same vein as that of ancient biography. Notwithstanding, though the exact classifications vary based on comparison and narrative traits, the preponderance of scholarly investigation over the past twenty years places Luke-Acts in the continuum of ancient historiography.

Parsons and Pervo contend that differences between Luke and Acts cannot be adequately explained based on the underlying sources.⁷ There are a number of differences they pinpoint as evidence. First, the speeches of Acts demarcate it from the narrative of Luke, which is largely void of rhetorical speeches. Second, journeys in Luke serve as vehicles for moving the plot along but lack circumstantial detail. In contrast, the journeys in Acts contain significant detail on geography and other relevant facets as the missionary activity moves from one locale to the next. Third, punishment is dispensed to those who commit wicked deeds in Acts, whereas sinners

⁶*Making of Luke-Acts*, 132-34.

⁷The argument is threefold: (1) the implied author was capable of introducing episodic pieces and scenes into Luke, as in the case of Acts; (2) the type of sources selected or available is not without relevance to the issue of genre; and (3) the implied author of Luke is seemingly an active editor able to modify sources to coincide with genre intent (Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking*, 37).

receive forgiveness in Luke. Finally, the community of believers in Luke stands in stark contrast with those in Acts. More specifically, persons from the margins of society and religion are embraced by Jesus as “true” disciples in Luke, while the very groups denounced in Luke – persons of wealth and status – largely comprise – and even lead – the believing community in Acts.⁸

1.1.1 Generic Incoherence

Parsons’ and Pervo’s premise that Acts coincides most closely with the genre of ancient novels largely draws on the argument that Pervo put forth in his dissertation at Harvard University, which was published as a monograph, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*, in 1987. His methodological approach is to examine successors, not predecessors as is the case with much of ancient generic analysis today, identifying trajectories of similarity and subsequently circumscribing the genre classifications of the source trajectories upon Luke and Acts. Pervo rejects classification of Luke and Acts as historiography on the basis that the narrative exhibits facets incongruent with historiography. The various areas that he identifies as running counter to that found in Greco-Roman historiography include: (1) persistent use of an omniscient narrator; (2) breadth of dialogue and direct speech; (3) techniques for plotting and structure, including quantity and quality of entertaining narrative; (4) limitations of style; (5) nature of the subject (i.e., the focus of historiography was character formation – something he does not believe is present in Luke-Acts); and (6) presence of “fiction” (i.e., literary license in creating episodic narrative). More recently, Pervo concludes that the narrative discourse of Luke and Acts necessitates two

⁸Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking*, 37-40.

separate stories: Luke presents the story of “a ‘reform’ movement or sect within emergent Judaism,” whereas Acts delineates a story “of an explosion of Gentile converts who worshiped Jesus Christ the Lord, that is, the rise of a new cult.”⁹ At the basis of this argument is the contention that Luke envisions the Christian movement as an outgrowth of the Jewish community, while Acts demarcates the Christian movement as exclusive – an entity of which the Jewish community is not a part. Also integral to Pervo’s case is that Luke and Acts fit into a model of successive competition. Luke rewrites the stories found in Mark and Q and is intended as a “replacement” to those prior stories. The influential Gospel of the later second century, *Protevangelium Jacobi*, for which Luke was a major source and model, was intended as the “replacement” to Luke. In regard to Acts, Pervo proposes that it was a “replacement” to the letters of Paul, and that the *Acts of Paul* was its “replacement” successor.¹⁰ The end result of this analysis is that Luke falls into the ancient genre of biography and Acts into that of the novel. Parsons and Pervo also use the early canonical shape of the New Testament “canon” as evidence of the generic distinction between Luke and Acts, positing that the separation of Luke and Acts and placement of Acts with the General Epistles shows a predilection to view both works separately by early readers.¹¹

⁹“Israel’s Heritage and Claims upon the Genre(s) of Luke and Acts: The Problems of History,” in *Heritage of Israel*, 142-43.

¹⁰“A Hard Act to Follow: *The Acts of Paul* and the Canonical Acts,” *Journal of Higher Criticism* 2 (1995) 3-32. However cf. Richard Bauckham, “The Acts of Paul as Sequel to Acts,” in *Ancient Literary Setting*, 105-52.

¹¹*Rethinking*, 8-13, 42-43.

1.1.2 Narrative Differences

Parsons and Pervo build upon the areas of narrative incoherence as earlier identified by Dawsey.¹² To begin, usage of some words in Luke that accord with the development of the early church is largely absent in Acts, where such would be expected. Some of the more obvious discrepancies include: (1) the word μαθητής appears almost always with the personal genitive in Luke – thereby directing the implied reader to ascribe a possessing noun or pronoun to it for qualification – whereas μαθητής appears only once with a qualifying genitive in Acts; (2) the appellation ἀδελφός is a designation for “fellow Christian” in Acts but is used to denote kinship in Luke; and (3) the careful use of titles for Jesus in Luke is not near as noticeable in Acts, in which titles and appellation formulas are often used interchangeably. The next discrepancy, though certainly not a new argument, relates to variations in the styles of Luke and Acts.¹³ These include semitisms and Septuagintalisms that are not used in the same way in Luke and Acts, as well as a potential stylistic predilection towards Attic construction in Acts.¹⁴ Third, the voice of the protagonists and the narrator in Acts is difficult to distinguish, whereas Jesus’ voice and that of the narrator in Luke are clearly demarcated. Fourth, parables as pedagogical vehicles – *contra* their regular use in Luke for such purpose – virtually disappear in Acts. Fifth, based on redactional

¹²Dawsey, “Literary Unity,” 48-66.

¹³A.W. Argyle, “The Greek of Luke and Acts,” *New Testament Studies* 20 (1973-74) 441-45, posits a number of stylistic differences between Luke and Acts. Brian E. Beck, “The Common Authorship of Luke and Acts,” *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976-77) 346-52, refutes much of Argyle’s argument.

¹⁴Examples afforded by Dawsey include the construction of (καὶ) ἐγένετο with a following verb in Luke, use of the Attic formula οὐκ ὀλίγος in Acts, and more frequent use of the Attic τὲ in Acts (“Literary Unity,” 58-61).

analysis of how the implied author of Luke uses the Markan source, there is a tendency to omit repetition and parallels *contra* the frequent use of pairs in Acts. Finally, despite widely recognized linkage or interlacing between Luke and Acts, there are a number of gaps and discrepancies between the two works. These include (1) differences in the ascension narrative (Lk 24.50-53 versus Acts 1.5-11); (2) reference to a saying of Jesus in Acts 20.35 that has no reference in Luke; (3) significant variance between the characterization of John the Baptist in Luke (Lk 3.1-22; 7.18-35) and the quotation of John the Baptist in Acts 13.25; (4) Lk 1.1-4 shows no evidence of anticipating a second volume and moreover Luke 24.12-53 goes to great lengths to provide a sense of narrative closure; and (5) differences between the narrator in Luke and the one in Acts.¹⁵

1.1.3 *Theological Dissonance*

Theological dissonance between Luke and Acts is the final area cited as evidence against the unity of Luke-Acts. The argument in this area is more of a complaint than a detailed case, however. Parsons and Pervo contend that theological investigation of Luke and Acts is flawed in that it begins with Luke and then locates

¹⁵The most notable difference identified by Parsons and Pervo is in the type of narrator in Luke versus the one in Acts: the heterodiegetic narrator (i.e., a narrator who does not participate in the story) of Luke becomes a homodiegetic narrator (i.e., a narrator who participates in the story) in Acts. Other discrepancies in the narrators of Luke and Acts include: (1) attention to settings in Luke not present in Acts; (2) use of unique techniques in Acts to identify certain characters, a mode not employed in Luke; (3) greater importance of temporal summaries in Acts versus Luke; (4) more favorable characterization of the Jewish populace in Luke than in Acts; (5) Jesus, *contra* the protagonists of Acts, like the narrator, is able to discern the feelings and thoughts of other characters; and (6) narrative asides in Luke provide details on persons or places unfamiliar to the reader, whereas narrative asides in Acts function in a different manner – the need to convey reliability of the narrator to the reader (*Rethinking*, 67-77).

the themes identified in Luke within the narrative discourse of Acts.¹⁶ They also assert that the Jesus of Luke is different from the exalted Jesus of Acts in that Jesus does not seem to have a particular saving relevance in Acts.

1.2 Coherent Unity

Those who argue against the unity of Luke-Acts are a minority contingent. Though variance exists regarding the precise genre of Luke-Acts, most scholars concur there is significant evidence within the narrative discourse to view Luke-Acts as a single corpus. In addition, while the unity of Luke and Acts is rebutted on generic, narrative, and theological grounds, there is virtual complete consensus that Acts forms some sort of sequel to Luke.¹⁷ A majority of scholars view Luke and Acts as possessing significant facets of generic, narrative, and theological coherence. In addition, a growing number find sufficient evidence to classify Luke-Acts in the vein of ancient historiography, though significant debate and disagreement exists in regard to how closely the narrative can be classified as Hellenistic historiography. In particular, *contra* Parsons and Pervo, I suggest that areas in which the narrative discourse exhibits dissonance (or “gaps”) are largely seen as narrative or rhetorical devices rather than proof of disunity.

1.2.1 Generic Coherence

Immense scrutiny of the prefaces in Lk 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1-2 surrounds much of the investigation of Luke-Acts during the past two decades. Issues at the forefront

¹⁶*Rethinking*, 84-114, esp. 114-15.

¹⁷This is even admitted by Parsons and Pervo (*Rethinking*, *passim*). Their contention is that the generic, narrative, and theological dissonance is significant enough to erase the *hyphen* and push the two farther apart than has traditionally been the case in most investigations of the two volumes.

such as the question of genre, construction of purpose, and even identification of the recipients are closely tethered to the two prefaces. The preface in Acts 1.1-2 refers to an initial volume and moreover exhibits an awareness of the story (i.e., consisting of plot, characterization, and *topoi*) contained therein. The beginning of a second volume, rather than indicating a turn to a different story, is seen as a matter of physical expediency, as ancient authors divided their lengthy works into individual books, each of which fit on to one papyrus roll.¹⁸ The division of Luke-Acts into two volumes was a matter of symmetrical separation of the narrative discourse in that components of Luke are paralleled in Acts: (1) the narration of Jesus' final days in Jerusalem in Lk 19.28-24.53 and Paul's arrest, trials, and arrival in Rome in Acts 21:27-28.31 each occupy approximately twenty-five percent of their respective volumes;¹⁹ (2) both Luke and Acts begin in Jerusalem; (3) Luke ends and Acts begins with the episode regarding the ascension of Jesus; and (4) the time span covered by both is approximately thirty years.

Claims that Luke – and even Acts in some instances – corresponds with the generic style and conventions of ancient biography in contrast to those of ancient historiography do not completely fit with the narrative discourse.²⁰ While Luke certainly contains elements of various literary genres, including that of biography, it

¹⁸See Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 45-47.

¹⁹This observation is made by David Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Library of Early Christianity, 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987) 118.

²⁰The most ardent proponent of classifying Luke and Acts as ancient biography is Talbert (*Literary Patterns, passim*; idem, "Once Again: Gospel Genre," *Semeia* 43 [1988] 53-74; idem, "The Acts of the Apostles: monograph or 'bios'?" in *History, Literature and Society*, 58-71). Also, Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Society for New Testament Monograph Series, 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

exhibits characteristics that point beyond the boundaries of the biographical genre. To begin, if Luke is a succession biography (i.e., such as that of the ancient philosophers in which the story of the teacher is followed with that of his students), as initially argued by Talbert, one would expect for it to conclude with a succession list. Second, most biographies focus on the life and character of one individual, with that notation contained in their prefaces.²¹ The preface of Luke is larger in scope; it refers not only to the life of Jesus but to a series of events.²² Third, historiography contains elements of biography, an observation that discounts argument in favor of categorizing Luke as biography on the basis that it exhibits biographical conventions. Finally, though examples of multi-volume works from antiquity exist that coincide as distinct genres, including historiography, these instances clearly indicate the change in subject matter and genre in the preface – something that is absent in the preface of Acts.²³

Luke and Acts share a number of characteristics with historiography that suggest affinity, including symposia, travel narratives, speeches, dramatic episodes, letters, and more.²⁴ Despite growing consensus around classification of Luke-Acts

²¹See Witherington, *Acts*, 16; Terrance Callan, “The Preface to Luke-Acts and Historiography,” *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985) 576-81.

²²See, e.g., David P. Moessner, “And Once Again: What Sort of ‘Essence’? A Response to Charles Talbert,” *Semeia* 43 (1988) 75-84; idem, “Re-reading Talbert’s Luke,” in *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. Michael C. Parsons and Joseph B. Tyson (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 203-28. However cf. the response of Talbert (“Reading Chance, Moessner, and Parsons,” in *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert*, 229-40).

²³In addition to Parsons and Pervo (*Rethinking*), David W. Palmer, “Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph,” in *Ancient Literary Setting*, 1-29, argues that Luke represents the genre of ancient biography and Acts coincides with the genre of the historical monograph, a subset of ancient historiography. See Loveday C.A. Alexander, “The Preface to Acts and the Historians,” in *History, Literature and Society*, esp. 84-99, who points out that sequel prefaces in ancient narrative indicate a generic change – something absent in Acts 1.1-2.

²⁴Aune, *Literary Environment*, 120-31.

within the genre of historiography, there remains significant disagreement as to how the two works relate. Comparison of the prefaces of Luke and Acts finds that they embody too many features not normally associated with ancient historiography and moreover lack enough of the style and language characteristic of such highly literary art.²⁵ Nevertheless, there is a growing concurrence that the prefaces contain sufficient rhetorical components, in conjunction with the remainder of the narrative, for the implied reader to locate Luke-Acts within the boundaries of ethnographical or cultural historiography.²⁶ Specifically, the generic style and conventions of Luke-Acts fit most closely within a literary matrix of the Greek-speaking Jewish Diaspora; Luke-Acts, therefore, is positioned by the two prefaces at a generic intersection, whereby historiography – formulated within the generic context of biblical historiography – forms the center and is surrounded by other elements from genres such as the novel, the epic, and the biography.²⁷ Significant fluidity in ancient genre denotes the ease with

²⁵Alexander, *Preface*, *passim*; eadem, “Luke’s Preface,” 48-74; eadem, “Preface to Acts,” 73-103.

²⁶See the comments of Marshall in regard to the challenge to the unity of Luke-Acts (“‘Israel’ and the Story of Salvation: One Theme in Two Parts,” in *Heritage of Israel*, 340): “Nevertheless, it is safe to say that their challenge has probably led to a stronger, because better defended, case for the unity of Luke-Acts.”

The two scholars who have argued the ethnographic generic connotations are Sterling, (*Historiography*) and Alexander (*Preface*; eadem, “Luke’s Preface,” 48-74), though both posit different literary and genre parallels for Luke-Acts: “Apologetic historiography” in the case of Sterling and “scientific treatise” for Alexander. In close association to the argument of Sterling and Alexander, see that of Kota Yamada, who places Luke-Acts within the parameters of “rhetorical historiography” (“A Rhetorical History: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht [Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 131; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994] 230-50; idem, “The Preface to the Lukan Writings and Rhetorical Historiography,” in *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps [Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999] 154-72).

²⁷See, e.g., Alexander, “Fact or Fiction,” 380-99.

which generic forms overlapped and moreover could be manipulated to serve the rhetorical aims of the implied author.²⁸

1.2.2 Narrative Connections, Echoes, and Coherence

Preponderance of narrative coherence between Luke and Acts perhaps presents the most compelling case in terms of overarching unity between the two works. The few instances of narrative incongruence withstanding, the narrative discourse of Luke and Acts demonstrates a number of linkages ranging from direct connections to indirect echoes. In addition, many of the so-called narrative “gaps” are indicative of any narrative discourse, including that of Greco-Roman antiquity. The most obvious connection between the two narratives is in the form of internal parallelisms that tie together the plot line as well as various thematic motifs.²⁹ The following are some of

²⁸See the comments of Loveday C.A. Alexander, “Marathon or Jericho? Reading Acts in Dialogue with Biblical Historiography,” in *Auguries: The Jubilee Volume of the Sheffield Department of Biblical Studies*, ed. David J.A. Clines and Stephen D. Moore (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 269; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 122, 124-25:

Unlike Herodotus, Luke does not create an epistemological space that would allow him to question the religious beliefs of his characters; indeed, his use of the first person makes it clear that he shares them. In terms of a stark distinction between ‘Greek’ and ‘Jewish’ historiography, Luke falls incluctably on the ‘Jewish’ side.

The paradigm for the writing of history, in that tradition, is not so much ‘investigation’ as testimony, and its parameters are defined by a commitment to a concept of truth that is nothing if not theological. Precisely for this reason, it is a tradition that makes a much more insistent claim on the reader than Homer or even Herodotus. Readers whose notion of history was defined by this tradition would have had no difficulty in recognizing Acts as the work of a historian.

²⁹See, e.g., Praeder, “Parallelisms in Luke-Acts,” 23-39, who surveys studies on the identification of parallelisms in Luke-Acts from the nineteenth century to the present. The most well-known inquiry into the presence of these parallel patterns is that of Talbert, *Literary Patterns, passim*. More recently, cf. Green, “Internal repetition in Luke-Acts: contemporary narratology and Lucan historiography,” in *History, Literature and Society*, 283-99, who builds on the earlier work of Talbert, pointing out a number of intertextual reverberations between

the more notable ones. To begin, the narrative of Luke contains instances of foreshadowing that functions as a focusing technique, prompting the implied reader to listen for certain *topoi* in the subsequent narrative. Foreshadowing in this case entails both proleptic and analeptic activity on the part of the implied reader. For example, the implied reader recalls the foreshadowing of Lk 8.22-9.7 – which portrays Jesus as in control of the sea and having authority over demons – upon hearing Acts 27 – in which divine protection is extended to the disciples – and Acts 16.16-18 and 19.13-20 – whereby divine authority is depicted as superior to demonic powers and magic. In another instance of foreshadowing, Jesus' emphasis on the responsibility of benefaction by the wealthy in Luke (e.g., 12.22-34; 16.19-31) is enacted by wealthy disciples in Acts (e.g., 2.43-47; 4.32-37). Second, a series of complimentary visions form a juxtaposed thread, ranging from that of Zachariah/Mary (Lk 1.8-56), to Saul/Ananias (Acts 9.1-9), to Cornelius/Peter (Acts 10). Indeed, there are a number of close parallels between each of these episodes, with resulting ramifications on the construction of meaning by the implied reader.³⁰ Third, there is significant correspondence between Jesus' journey to Jerusalem in Luke (9.51-24.53) and Paul's journey to Rome in Acts (19.21-28.16): length of journey, divine necessity, understanding of friends/disciples, seizure/arrest, four trials, declaration of innocence, and salvation.³¹ Finally, parallelism in narrative discourse extends to the actual depiction of characterization, with noted parallelisms between Jesus and Paul, Jesus

Luke and Acts.

³⁰See Joel B. Green, "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1-2," *Bulletin of Biblical Research* 4 (1994) 61-84; idem, "Internal Repetition," 293-94.

³¹See Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 15-23. Also, Charles H. Talbert and John H. Hayes, "A Theology of Sea Storms in Luke-Acts," in *Heritage of Israel*, 282-83.

and Stephen, Joseph of Arimathea and Gamaliel.³² Emphasis on parallelisms between characters within both Luke and Acts is further corroboration of this point; there is an obvious interest on the part of the implied author to construct meaning for the implied reader through character parallelism, with examples that include Jesus and John the Baptist, Elizabeth and Mary, Peter and Paul, Barnabas and Ananias/Sapphira.

Rather than serving as evidence of disunity, many of the differences in the narrative discourse function as rhetorical vehicles and coincide with the predilections of ancient narrative. A significant amount of research has been expended on the dissonance between the narrative closure of Luke (24.50-53) and the narrative opening in Acts (1.6-11). The initial narrative preface in Acts (1.1-2) presents Acts as a sequel to the earlier volume, a continuation of the story contained therein, with the closing scene of the first volume serving as the opening scene in the second. Such has certain implications on how the implied reader construes plot, characterization, and *topoi* in Acts; the narrative discourse of Luke establishes a precedence that serves as an analeptic interpretive framework. Further, use of narrative recapitulation at the beginning of successive volumes is a common mode of discourse in the case of multi-volume narrative works from Greco-Roman antiquity.³³ Of course, as Alexander notes, this does not preclude the possibility that Luke was originally conceived as a single-volume work, with the implied author making a subsequent decision to add Acts as an

³²Talbert (*Literary Patterns*) suggests a number of character parallels in Luke-Acts, including Jesus/Stephen, Peter/Paul, and Jesus/Paul. Praeder builds upon his argument ("Parallels in Luke-Acts," 23-39). For the parallels between Joseph of Arimathea and Gamaliel, see Darr, "Irenic or Ironic?" 121-37, esp. 126-27.

³³Alexander ("Preface to Acts," 79-82, 89-92) argues that recapitulation is actually much more indicative of the "scientific treatise" genre type than that of ancient historiography. This serves as one of her arguments in favor of classifying Luke-Acts within the genre of the scientific treatise.

afterthought.³⁴ As a result, the extent to which the closure in Luke (24.50-53) is complete (or incomplete) – one of the arguments against the unity of Luke-Acts – is mute.

That said, a couple of other components point in the direction of narrative unity; specifically, the narrative discourse in Luke posits *topoi* that do not come to fruition until the story told in Acts. The prophetic prediction of Simeon in Lk 2.25-35 that Jesus would bring about delivery of salvation to the Gentiles (“a light for revelation to the Gentiles”) largely does not come to realization in Luke, as Jesus has minimal interaction with non-Jews in the narrative of Luke. It is only in the narrative of Acts in which this prophetic pronouncement becomes a reality.³⁵ Corroboration of this connection occurs via *inclusio*, whereby the inclusion of σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 28.28 links to the projection of universal salvation near the end of the Simeon episode (Lk 2.34) and transition to the ministry of John the Baptist (Lk 3.6).³⁶ Further, linkage of Luke and Acts can be argued from the standpoint of narrative cycles – as embedded in Aristotle’s need for a beginning, middle, and end in narrative – as a unity.³⁷ In this

³⁴*Ibid.*, 79. However, if, as Marguerat observes, there is evidence of redactional activity on the part of the implied author – whereby the implied author modified material from Mark or Q in order to retain the use of the material in Acts (e.g., the false witness concerning the destruction of the temple in Mark 14.58 to Acts 6.14; suspension of purity law in Mark 7.1-23 to Acts 10; abbreviation of the citation from Is 6.9-10 in Lk 8.10b for much fuller elaboration in Acts 28.16-31) – then there is objective “proof” that the implied author had the composition of Acts in mind when writing Luke (*Christian Historian*, 47-48).

³⁵For this reading, see Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 10.

³⁶See David L. Tiede, “‘Glory to Thy People Israel’: Luke-Acts and the Jews,” in *Heritage of Israel*, 21-34, for this observation.

³⁷See the discussion of “narrative cycle” in Bal, *Narratology*, 19-23.

context, the progression from possibility (Lk 1 to Acts 1) to realization (Acts 2-15) to result (Acts 16-28) is only complete when Luke-Acts is viewed as a whole.³⁸

Variance in word usage between Luke and Acts is relatively minor and thus does not present sufficient grounds to pose a narrative division between Luke and Acts. Indeed, in most instances, the argument is fragile. Several examples will suffice. To begin, the differences in Septuagintalisms are a contested issue and moreover some of the LXX stylistic features of Acts are found in other Hellenistic historians.³⁹ Second, the redactional tendency of the implied author of Luke to minimize or eliminate repetitions found in Mark does not obviate the presence of repetition in the narrative discourse.⁴⁰ The intratextual linkages between the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry – including verbal repetition – is one such example. Third, insertion of the narrator in Acts into the actual story is not indicative in-and-of itself of evidence against Luke-Acts unity. Rather, the first-person narrator likely provides the implied reader with an intertextual link to the Homeric epic – as found in the storm scene of the *Odyssey* as well as elsewhere in the *Odyssey*.⁴¹ The use of the “we” passages also serves a rhetorical purpose; the implied reader indirectly participates in the Pauline missionary activities, with actualization of this association prompting the implied

³⁸See Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 8-9.

³⁹For this observation, see David L. Mealand, “Hellenistic Historians and the Style of Acts,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 82 (1991) 42-66.

⁴⁰See, e.g., Green, “Internal Repetition,” 283-99.

⁴¹Initially noted by Vernon K. Robbins, “By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages,” in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978] 215-42. Though not the first to notice the connection, the most thorough investigation of the close affinity in terms of literary similarities between the narrative of Acts 16-28 and the *Odyssey* is that of MacDonald (“Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul,” 88-107; idem, “Luke’s Eutychus,” 4-24).

reader to embrace Paul’s message and actions.⁴² Further, simply from the standpoint of logical argumentation, inclusion of the first-person narrator in Acts – in contradistinction to the use of the omniscient third-person narrator throughout the narrative of Luke – is not sufficient evidence to pose a cogent argument against Luke-Acts’ unity. Finally, absence of parables as pedagogical vehicles in Acts is not necessarily evidence of an incoherence in style between Luke and Acts. Rather, the ascension of Jesus brings about – as recognized by the closure of the first volume and beginning of the second – a transformation in the teaching focus to the Lord Jesus Christ.

1.2.3 *Theological Congruence*

The argument of Parsons and Pervo against the theological unity of Luke-Acts is specious: they do not specify differences but rather argue against the methodological approach of normal theological investigation, contending that it begins with Luke and then overlays identified themes on to Acts. There is nothing wrong in building a picture of theological coherence between Luke and Acts by starting with Luke. The findings elicited by this approach are legitimate in and of themselves. In addition, the reasons

⁴²The precise “rhetorical intent” of the “we” passages is debated. The crux of the debate hinges on the identity ascribed by the implied reader to the plural narrator, with two basic views. The first contends that there is a convergence between the implied author and the narrator, thus bringing about a sense of verisimilitude to the narrative by prompting the implied reader to view the implied author as an actual eye-witness to the events being told (e.g., Robbins, “By Land and By Sea,” 215-42; Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 111-24). The second, and the more recent proposal, asserts that the implied reader is prompted to associate with the first-person narrator and thus as an heir (or a continuation) of the Pauline missionary legacy (e.g., Bonz, *Past as Legacy*, 170-73).

Parsons and Pervo cite are not evidence of theological disunity but rather merely a complaint against current theological investigation of Luke-Acts.⁴³

Admittedly, Parsons and Pervo are correct in noting the need to recognize that the mode of reading as both a forward and backward activity. However, as Alexander recently demonstrates, a retrospective reading of Luke-Acts by the implied reader engenders a number of *topoi* – in particular, connections between the conclusion of Acts 28.16-31 and the beginning of Luke (1.1-4.30).⁴⁴ Specifically, she conducts a thorough investigation of Luke-Acts through the lens of the conclusion of Acts (28.17-31), finding that there is significant coherence – and thus dependence – from a retrospective standpoint.

2 REPRESENTATION OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE (ISRAEL)

A significant amount of discussion surrounds the representation of the Jewish people and the ultimate depiction of Israel's future in Luke-Acts. Indeed, it is probably one of the topics in Lukan research that is least likely to generate consensus among scholars. Specifically, characterization of the Jewish people in Luke-Acts is closely tethered to the question of whether or not the narrative discourse communicates a severing of Israel from the hope of salvation. The derivation of the disagreement is that Luke-Acts does not seem to address the issue in a consistent fashion. Some scholars contend the implied author positions the Jewish people as forever damned and excised

⁴³Marshall ("Story of Salvation," 340-57) notes five overlapping theological themes in Luke-Acts: (1) Jesus as Proclaimer and Proclaimed; (2) the sending of apostles and witnesses; (3) the prominence of the kingdom and Messiah; (4) discipleship as the appropriate response to the Gospel; and (5) salvation offered to all.

⁴⁴See Alexander, "Back to Front," 419-46.

beyond the boundaries of salvation.⁴⁵ Others insist the narrative discourse does not demarcate an indelible line of separation between the unbelieving elements of the Jewish people and the hope of salvation.⁴⁶ While there is certainly ambiguity in terms of the evidence contained within the narrative discourse, there is sufficient evidence that makes the latter position the more defensible of the two. Discussion – both for a positive and negative portrayal of the Jewish people – revolves around several different textual groupings and trajectories, which I will now overview.

2.1 Conclusion of Acts (28.17-31): Future Hope for the Jewish People

The most prominent and perhaps the hermeneutical key for understanding the portrayal of the Jewish people in Luke-Acts is the ending of Acts.⁴⁷ Introduction of the intertextual citation from Isa 6.9-10 embodies various connotations in regard to the characterization of the Jewish people, seemingly positioning the Jewish people in

⁴⁵Representative proponents of this view include Ernst Haenchen (“Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54 [1963] 155-87); Jervell (*Luke and the People of God*); Heikki Räisänen (“The Redemption of Israel,” in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. P. Luomanen [Helsinki and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991] 94-114); Jack T. Sanders (“The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts,” in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert [New York: Crossroad, 1984] 104-28). Most recently, Martin Rese, “The Jews in Luke-Acts: Some Second Thoughts,” in *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 357-95.

⁴⁶Perhaps the most prominent proponent of a positive portrayal of the Jewish people in the past two decades is Robert C. Tannehill (e.g., “Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul’s Mission in Acts,” in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*, ed. Joseph B. Tyson [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988] 83-101; idem, “Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 [1985] 69-85). Others include Wasserberg, *Aus Israels*, 179-89; Tiede (“Glory to Thy People,” 21-34); Victor Fusco (“Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel,” *Novum Testamentum* 38 [1996] 1-17); David Ravens (*Luke and the Restoration of Israel* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995]).

⁴⁷It is important to note that “Israel” and the “Jewish people” are two different narrative components in the Lukan narrative discourse. The former is a rhetorical appellation used as a reference to the nation of Israel as represented in the LXX. The latter is much more “slippery” as a referent, encompassing a number of different characters and character groups in Luke-Acts (see discussion in chapter nine): Pharisees, Sadducees, lawyers, scribes, religious leaders, Jewish political leaders, the crowds (ὄχλος), and the people (λαός).

contradistinction to the Gentiles – the latter exhibiting openness to listen to the message proclaimed by Jesus and leaders in the early church and the former serving in opposition.⁴⁸ What should be noted in regard to the narrative discourse of Acts 28.23-28 is that the Jewish people are not excised from divine salvation. Indeed, *contra* earlier instances in the narrative (e.g., Acts 13.45; 18.6), the implied author does *not* characterize the Jewish people as putting forth a united front but rather consisting of some who believed and some who did not do so (28.24-25).

Instead of concluding on a decisive note regarding the relationship of the Jewish people and the salvation of God, the narrative discourse closes on an ambivalent note. The concluding summary (vv.30-31) extends the open-ended nature of the narrative in that the proclamation of the kingdom of God continues for a period of two years in an unhindered manner. The descriptive denotation that this preaching was delivered to “all those who came to him [Paul]” (v.30), without the inclusion of any restrictive narrative parameters, leaves the implied reader with the understanding that the audience was comprised of both Jews and Gentiles.⁴⁹ Those who embrace the negative portrayal of the Jewish people also reject the possibility of indecision on the part of the implied author. Evidence of other Greco-Roman narratives, including the conclusion of Mark (16.1-8), that withhold information from the implied reader,

⁴⁸Tannehill contends that the intertextual insertion of Isa 6.9-10 in Acts 28.25-28 conveys the understanding that the hopes of the Jewish people – as delineated in the infancy narratives (Lk 1-2) – will not come to fulfillment (e.g., “The Story of Israel within the Lucan Narrative,” in *Heritage of Israel*, 330).

⁴⁹For some of these points, see Marguerat, “Silent Closing of Acts,” 284-305, esp. 297-304. Also published as a chapter in his *Christian Historian*, 205-30; an earlier version appeared as “The End of Acts,” 74-89.

however, corroborates the possibility that the implied author of Luke-Acts would conclude the narrative discourse in an open-ended manner.⁵⁰

2.2 Final Separation Between the Jewish People and Salvation

The other text that is most often cited as representing an indication that the hope of salvation has ceased and no longer extends to the Jewish people is the first speech of Jesus in the Galilean ministry (Lk 4.14-30). As argued in chapter four, the rhetorical discourse of the speech does not address the future of the Jewish people, however, but rather challenges cultural boundaries; the discourse counters xenophobic confinement of salvific action to the Jewish people, while embracing the extension of salvation to those outside of religious, political, and cultural boundaries. In addition, the intertextual interplay of Isa 58.6 with Isa 61.1-2 strips the latter of its original juxtaposition of Israel and the Gentiles. This interpretive (or redactional) move by the implied author seems to mitigate construal of the discourse as a vituperation against the Jewish people; indeed, it functions in the reverse direction for the implied reader.

Some scholars confuse the rejection of the various Jewish groups throughout the narrative discourse – particularly the Pauline ministry in Acts 13-28 – as denoting universal repudiation. Rather, as several have observed, the negative reactions of the various Jewish groups quite often specifically apply to the particular group in question (e.g., the Jews in Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13.46; the Corinthian Jews in Acts 18.6) and should not be construed as a broad rejection of all the Jewish people. My position is that the closure of Acts simply depicts a transition – a new beginning – in the preaching of salvation to the Jewish people. The earlier prioritization of the preaching

⁵⁰Cf. Alexander, “Back to Front,” 428-29, 439-42; Marguerat, *Christian Historian*, 205-30.

to the Jewish people first and then to the Gentiles is no longer the norm; the new epoch envisioned by the implied author portrays the Jewish people as open to hearing the proclamation, with no indication of the mission *not* reaching both Jews and Gentiles.⁵¹

As to the ultimate representation of the Jewish people by the implied author, intertextual connotations – observed by Bernard Koet – generated via the intersection of Isa 51.17-23 in Simeon’s prophetic prediction in Lk 2.34, where the “falling” and “rising” represents two distinct salvific-historical movements, may provide the key: “ ... just as in Deutero-Isaiah the city of Jerusalem will rise again despite its destruction, so also does Luke believe that the one Israel, though fallen, can yet hope to be raised again based on the experience of salvation history.”⁵² Since Simeon’s prophetic pronouncement plays such a pivotal role in the conclusion of Acts (viz., the christological reference to τὸ σωτήριον [“salvation”] and its extension to the ἔθνων [“Gentiles”] by Simeon [Lk 2.29-32] and Paul’s concluding words to the Roman Jews [Acts 28.28] – τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ), the intertextual meaning generated via Simeon’s prophetic pronouncement carries forward to the

⁵¹See the comments of Michael Wolter (“Israel’s Future and the Delay of the Parousia, according to Luke,” in *Heritage of Israel*, 319):

... portrayal of the πρῶτοι among the Roman Jews in Acts 28:17-22 seems to mark something of a new beginning in the history of the preaching of Christ to the Jews. Compared to the Jerusalemite πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ (Lk 19.47; Acts 25:2), Luke portrays them as quite unprejudiced and interested in the proclamation concerning the Christ. Luke thus seems to envision the new epoch of the Christian mission beginning in Rome, and not a word suggests that this mission will not reach Jews as well.

⁵²“Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29-32c-35) und Israels Geschichte,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. Fran Segbroeck, 2d vol. (Louvain: Louvain Press, 1992) 1163.

conclusion of the narrative.⁵³ Such certainly fits with the eschatological position of the implied author in that expectation remains that salvation will be bestowed upon all of the Jewish people at the time of the parousia.

2.3 Eschatological Judgment for All of the Jewish People

The implied author establishes Jesus as one from whom the deliverance of Israel will commence via “reliable” characters such as Hannah (Lk 2.38) and Zechariah (Lk 1.68-71). There is a line of texts in Luke-Acts that seemingly lays claim to the extension of salvation to Israel, with the projection that the eschatological restoration of Jerusalem would embody such (e.g., Lk 13.35; 19.41-44; 24.21; Acts 1.6). Since the destruction of Jerusalem has already taken place (Lk 21.20-24b) and is part of the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader, the destruction of Jerusalem is not associated as being the same as the eschatological age by the implied reader.⁵⁴ To put it another way, for the implied reader, the eschatological punishment dispensed upon Jerusalem and moreover Israel is not viewed as the same as the eventual, expected eschatological coming of Jesus – namely, the coming end time.

Notwithstanding, the schism between the Jewish people and the Christian movement in Luke-Acts is indisputable. The closing of Acts (28.17-28) actually brings

⁵³There is growing consensus among various scholars that the intertextual connotations within the narrative discourse to Israel’s obduracy in the LXX tradition does not impose expectations of rejection on the part of the Jewish people upon the implied reader. Rather, since “hardening” in the LXX tradition typically follows with the possibility of future enlightenment, future hope for the Jewish people is understood by the implied reader. See, e.g., H. van de Sandt, “Acts 28,28: No Salvation for the People of Israel?” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 70 (1994) 341-58; Robert F. O’Toole, “Reflections on Luke’s Treatment of Jews in Luke-Acts,” *Biblica* 74 (1993) 547-55; Fusco, “Luke-Acts,” 7; Wolter, “Israel’s Future,” 311-12; Wasserberg, *Aus Israels*, 71-115.

⁵⁴See Gerhard Braumann, “Die Lucanische Interpretation de Zerstörung Jerusalems,” *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963) 120-27.

this to the forefront; the priority of missionary activity to preach salvation first to the Jewish people and then to the Gentiles in each geographical locale (as established in Acts 13.34) is nullified. Indeed, the prophetic words of Simeon (Lk 2.34-35) – who also, as one of the “reliable” characters of Luke-Acts, positions Jesus as one who would deliver salvation to Israel – is central in predicting the eventual schism that occurs with the Jewish people at the close of the narrative in Acts. However, Simeon’s prophetic words, as earlier discussed, are not evidence of a final rejection of Israel; indeed, they function in the exact opposite manner by means of the intertextual references to Deutero-Isaiah.

2.4 Representation of Paul and His Embodiment of Jewish Culture and the Law

Often overlooked by those who categorize the portrayal of the Jewish people as negative, the depiction of Paul and his relationship to Judaism, as leading up to the conclusion of Acts, is an aspect of the narrative discourse that runs counter to such a stance. Indeed, the implied author goes to great pains to portray Paul as an observant Jew, one who closely adheres to Jewish traditions.⁵⁵ Accordingly, a view that the implied author espouses a representation of the Jewish people – one perhaps even anti-Semitic in the opinion of some – in which they are forever severed from salvation does not make sense against the backdrop of this *topos*. My contention is that one must infer narrative confusion on the part of the implied author in order to maintain a view that embraces a negative representation of the Jewish people. Since few, if any, feel the implied author displays an aura of incompetence, this position becomes tenuous.

⁵⁵For this adumbration, see George P. Carras, “Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts: Paul, Jesus and Other Jews,” in *Unity of Luke-Acts*, 693-708.

3 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

I have shown in the above overview that there is adequate evidence to view Luke-Acts as a unified whole from generic, narrative, and theological vantage points. Many of the ostensible issues of disunity can be explained on the basis of the inherent characteristics of ancient Greco-Roman narrative. Further, in regard to the generic differences, there are not sufficient arguments to consider Luke-Acts as exhibiting two different genres and thus encompassing two different narrative frameworks. There are simply too many glaring differences between the generic markers of Luke-Acts and those found in Greco-Roman novels and biographies to consider Luke-Acts in the same lineage as those generic types. For the objections cited against theological unity, these are caveats against the sequential manner of most investigation today and *not* reasons for considering Luke-Acts as two separate works; it is a methodological issue and *not* a substantive unity issue.

In the case of the representation of the Jewish people, while there is a veritable *topos* of Jewish rejection – in both directions: Jewish people rejecting Jesus and therefore his message of salvation as well as Jesus and then the early church repudiating the Jewish people – there is compelling evidence that the implied author “does *not* close the door.” As such, per my above discussion, the implied author “leaves the door open” for the ongoing evangelization of the Jewish people and their acceptance of the message of salvation.⁵⁶

In order to understand how the rhetorical texture of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry fit into the overall narrative discourse of Luke-Acts, it is

⁵⁶Most notably, Fusco, “Future of Israel,” 1-17; van de Sandt, “Acts 28,28,” 341-58; O’Toole, “Luke’s Treatment,” 547-55; Marguerat, *Christian Historian*, 216-26.

important to view the two works as a uniform corpus. For example, narrative trajectories that extend into Acts would be a *non sequitur* if Acts is not a sequel to Luke. At the same time, adumbration of plot, characterization, theme, and *topoi* in Luke-Acts is partially determined by whether the Jewish people are viewed as a uniform, coherent entity or as representing several different character types – exhibiting both negative and positive characterizations. The former results in a more static construal of the narrative discourse, whereas the latter produces a more dynamic, fluid hermeneutical framework for the implied reader. As an example of the former, the Jewish people would coincide with *only* one of the four character types that are demarcated in the fourth Galilean speech of Jesus (Lk 8.4-18). Notwithstanding, a methodological approach that accounts for both proleptic and analeptic reading activities demonstrates that this is *not* the case; rather, the various characters and character groups representing the Jewish people fall into two or more character types – embodying different character traits, with some more so than others willing to embrace the message of “salvation to the ends of the earth.”

9

RHETORICAL TEXTURE AND NARRATIVE TRAJECTORIES: GENERATION OF PLOT, CHARACTERIZATION, AND *TOPOI*

The philosophical underpinnings of the more recent methodological endeavors in studies of Luke-Acts helped move the investigation of the construction of plot, characterization, and *topoi* (thematic motifs) beyond the vestiges of authorial intent.¹ Though the implied author, as represented by the narrative discourse, constrains possible construction of meaning, the potential modes of construction allow for the generation of multivalent meanings. Indeed, construction of the narrative discourse occurs as an ethical enactment between implied author, implied reader, and real reader. As discussed in chapter two, this interaction occurs on three different levels: extratextual repertoire (e.g., cultural codes and ideological systems), intertextuality (e.g., type scenes, textual echoes, citations, etc.), and intratextual coherence (e.g., repetition, narrative structure, etc.).

The four speeches of Jesus in the Lukan Galilean ministry, through their rhetorical texture, project various trajectories – both backwards to the preceding narrative (i.e., analeptic) and forwards to the subsequent narrative (i.e., proleptic) –

¹However cf. Moore, *Literary Criticism*, 3-24, 71-107, for a critique of the philosophical underpinnings of narrative and reader-response criticisms.

that facilitate the construction of narrative meaning by the implied reader. Among the expectations of the implied reader is the understanding that the rhetorical invention, arrangement, and style of the speeches serve as the interpretive matrix for each. In addition, the implied reader approaches the narrative discourse with the expectation that the speeches, particularly those at the beginning of the narrative, will be pivotal in providing the foundation for constructing key narrative components.²

I suggest, as a result, that an accurate and complete identification of the trajectories that extend backward and forward from the four speeches cannot occur apart from processing of the rhetorical elements by the implied reader. In this case, by melding several methodological approaches that examine the narrative using literary criticisms (viz., narrative and reader-response criticisms) informed by Greco-Roman rhetorical criticism, I am able to move the discussion beyond the rhetorical texture (which is where rhetorical criticism typically stops) to actual trajectories associated with the larger narrative while maintaining an ethical interaction with the implied author (which is often a failing of narrative and reader-response criticisms). Attempts to identify narrative trajectories based on the four speeches without consideration of their rhetorical texture run the risk of seeing only part of the narrative landscape and, in some instances, breaching the ethical obligations every reader should exhibit in relation to the implied author and implied reader.³ For the ease of analysis, I will overview the key elements of rhetorical texture identified for each speech in chapters

²Readers (or listeners) in Greco-Roman antiquity would not approach a text in total ignorance but rather approach it with certain assumptions and expectations based on extratextual repertoire (e.g., see M.J. Wheeldon, “‘True Stories’: the Reception of Historiography in Antiquity,” in *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, ed. A. Cameron [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990] 33-63).

³See, e.g., Booth, *Company We Keep*, *passim*.

four through seven and then adumbrate some of the potential narrative trajectories that guide the implied reader in the generation of plot, characterization, and *topoi*.

1 A METHODOLOGICAL BASIS AND FRAMEWORK

Investigation of the Luke-Acts corpus over the past twenty-five years is replete with analysis of plot and characterization. In addition, centrality of motifs common to the two works in the corpus was identified by some of the early pioneers of redaction criticism by means of locating a theological agenda.⁴ Subsequent narrative and reader-response criticisms build upon the work of the redaction critics. Indeed, the pivotal importance of “salvation” to the overarching discourse of Luke-Acts actually goes back to the work of the redaction critics. Though classification of “salvation” into three epochs has been critically discredited as insensitive to various aspects of the narrative discourse,⁵ there is significant coalescence around the recognition that Lukan theology and thus plot – as the vehicle for communicating such through action – centers around the thematic motif of “salvation to the ends of the earth.”⁶

⁴The concept of the implied author was obviously not within purview of the redaction critics. The first to propose examination of the presumed sources in Luke in order to identify the theological agenda of the “implied” author was Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (London: Faber and Faber, 1960).

⁵Conzelmann (*Theology, passim*) was the initial proponent of dividing Lukan salvation history into three periods – the period of Israel (from creation to the imprisonment of John the Baptist), the period of Jesus (from his baptism to ascension), the period of the church (from Jesus ascension to his parousia). He is followed by other redaction critics, including Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989) 59-63. There is now overwhelming argument against viewing Lukan “salvation” as consisting of three epochs (e.g., see François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-three Years of Research [1950-1983]* [Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 12; Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Press, 1987] 25-29).

⁶The ways in which “salvation” is construed obviously varies. The recognition of its primacy to Lukan theology is widely accepted, however (e.g., see Green, *Theology of the Gospel of Luke, passim*; Marshall, “Story of Salvation,” 340-56; John T. Carroll, “The God of Israel and the Salvation of the Nations: The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, in

As discussed in chapter two – congruent with ancient Greco-Roman narrative and unlike that of modernity (or even more so postmodernity), Luke-Acts is relatively unsophisticated in its presentation of plot – the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts does not present the implied reader with a series of multithreaded plot lines.⁷ In addition, consistent with narrative from the same time and cultural milieu, Luke-Acts demarcates a consistent plot line – in this case the extension of the narrative theme of “salvation to the ends of the earth” – surrounded by supporting thematic motifs (*topoi*) and characterization.⁸ The structuring of the plot line – that is, the selection and arrangement of the events and actions recounted – occurs as a result of an interaction between implied author and implied reader.⁹

The Forgotten God: Essays in Honor of Paul J. Achtemeier on the Occasion of His Seventy-fifth Birthday, ed. A.A. Das and F. J. Matera [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2002] 91-106).

⁷Note the comments of Aristotle (*Poetics*, 1453a.10-13): “A well-constructed plot should, therefore, be single in its issue, rather than double as some maintain. The change of fortune should be not from bad to good, but, reversely, from good to bad. It should come about as the result not of vice, but of some great error or frailty, in a character.” Also (*Poetics*, 1456a.10-11): “Again, the poet should remember what has been often said, and not make an epic structure into a tragedy – by an epic structure I mean one with a multiplicity of plots.”

⁸As discussed earlier, Prince (*Narrative as Theme*, 3-7) differentiates between the overarching theme of a narrative discourse and its plot line on the basis that “theme” unifies all of the various textual elements in a narrative, including that of plot (also motifs and characterization). In particular, he contends that “theme” – *contra* plot – lacks narrative movement/action.

Notwithstanding, while quite possibly indicative of modern and postmodern narrative, plot assumes the characteristics of theme in ancient Greco-Roman narrative, thereby positing a view that envisions a confluence of theme and plot. This understanding coincides with Aristotle’s equation of plot with action/sequencing and the primacy of plot over all other narrative components (*Poetics* 1450b.1-3, 1454a.15-35, 1454b.1-15). See Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (London/Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1966) 26-30, 207-39, for a discussion of the differences of plot in antiquity and modernity.

⁹The selection and arrangement of events and actions as an interactive reader-text activity is described by Paul Ricoeur as “emplotment,” which he explains, based on the observations of Aristotle, embodies a configurational character as an imitation of reality, at least that as constructed by the implied author (*From Text to Action*, 1-20). In particular, cf.

Also *contra* modern narrative but in the same literary vein as Greco-Roman narrative, Luke-Acts employs characters and thematic motifs (*topoi*) to move the plot along. The complex characterization, including glimpses (or more) into the psychological makeup of the characters, of modern narrative is not present in the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts. Characters and character groups – vis-à-vis their actions and words – are evaluated based on rhetorical grids, embedded by the implied author, through which the implied reader construes characterization in relationship to the plot line.¹⁰ Further, the various thematic motifs (*topoi*) that arise from the narrative, such as patronage, hospitality, suffering through tribulation, the relationship of Jesus and John the Baptist – to name just a few – are *a part of* but *not separate from* the overarching plot line. To put it another way, the various *topoi* in Luke-Acts contribute to (i.e., follow) the plot line rather than run parallel or even against it (as is frequently the case with modern narrative).

Authors in ancient Greco-Roman narrative employ frameworks, such as prefaces, transitional summaries, speeches, and epilogues, through which the implied reader constructs meaning from the narrative discourse.¹¹ I shall argue, in addition to the prefaces of Luke and Acts and the first two chapters of Luke, that the four

Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1450a.2-4: “Plot is the imitation of the action – for by plot I here mean that in virtue of which we ascribe certain qualities to the agents. Thought is required whenever a statement is proved, or, it may be a general truth enunciated.” Also, cf. the discussion of the cumulative effect of narrative events described as “amplification” by Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 11.1-12.2.

¹⁰Aristotle subsumes characterization to plot (*Poetics*, 1450a.15-23): “The plot, then, is the first principle, and, as it were, the soul of a tragedy: character holds the second place. A similar fact is seen in painting. The most beautiful colors, laid on confusedly, will not give as much pleasure as the chalk outline of a portrait. Thus tragedy is the imitation of an action, and of the agents mainly with a view to the action.”

¹¹For an excellent discussion of the roles of frameworks in narrative, see Genette, *Palimpsests*.

speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry are integral to moving forward the plot line, construction of characterization, and delineation of *topoi*. This is corroborated by other ancient Greco-Roman narratives, where speeches explain not only what happened but why these events took place, with the latter compelling the implied reader to imitate the successful actions of characters or avoid their failings.¹²

2 FRAMING THE NARRATIVE DISCOURSE: LUKAN PROLOGUE

The prologue (1.1-4) in Luke has received much scholarly attention and is seen by many as the key in establishing literary genre as well as adumbrating the ideological parameters of the implied author. Several aspects of the Lukan prologue are relevant to my discussion of the four speeches of the Galilean ministry. First, vis-à-vis the prologue, the implied author introduces the implied reader to a well-known rhetorical mode; the use of a Greek-style preface was prevalent in Greco-Roman antiquity, ranging from the technical to the non-technical narrative. Green explains that these prefaces share common elements “such as the author’s name; dedication and/or request; remarks regarding the subject matter, including its importance and implications; (often diminutive) mention of predecessors; a claim to appropriate methodology; and the transition to the work itself.”¹³ Second, the sophisticated vocabulary and style of the prologue, coupled with the fact that a relative few were

¹²See, e.g., Toohey, *Reading Epic*; Hunter, *Past and Process*. Also, cf. Marion L. Soards, “The Speeches in Acts in Relation to Other Pertinent Ancient Literature,” *Études théologiques et religieuses* 70 (1994) 65-90; Stanley E. Porter, “Thucydides 1.22.1 and Speeches in Acts: Is There a Thucydidean View?” *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990) 121-42. Investigation of the relationship of speeches in Luke-Acts to those in Greco-Roman narrative largely focuses on the speeches of Acts, however, with little or no attention paid to those in Luke.

¹³*Gospel of Luke*, 34.

literate in antiquity, suggests an implied author of some education, probably from an urban environment.¹⁴ Third, the correspondence of the Lukan corpus and middlebrow narrative (whether historiography or the scientific tradition) implies that the implied author had a general appreciation for the artisan class – free artisans and those with small businesses – which, based on recent investigation, were a significant composition within first-century Christian communities.¹⁵ Finally, as briefly discussed in chapter two, the implied author – rather than using the addressee “Theophilus” in a symbolic manner to represent a larger audience (viz., “dear to God” or “lover of God”) as some argue – recognizes the role of Theophilus in the writing of the corpus: Theophilus provides benefaction by facilitating the circulation of the document to his family and friends. In doing so, the implied author hopes, through Theophilus’ recommendation and circle of friends and influences, that the narrative would gain a wider audience. This contextual understanding broadens the “reading” location of the authorial audience – a textual construct like the implied reader but also a multidimensional ideological, real life-and-blood construct.

3 FIRST SPEECH OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY (LK 4.14-30)

There exists a virtual unending series of investigations into understanding how the implied author establishes overarching thematic unity in the narrative discourse via Jesus’s speech that inaugurates his ministry (Lk 4.14-30). Indeed, it is almost uniformly held to be programmatic in the quest to understand the narrative discourse

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 35.

¹⁵Specifically, Alexander, “Luke’s Preface,” 48-74; eadcm, *Preface*, 200-05.

of Luke-Acts.¹⁶ I concur with these earlier findings and suggest closer attention to the rhetorical texture of the speech both supplements as well as contributes to an understanding of how and why the speech is a driving factor in shaping the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts.

3.1 Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture

In the fourth chapter I suggested the inaugural speech includes examples from the past (viz., 4.24-27) that orient the implied reader and narrative audience to embrace the understanding that “salvation” will extend to Gentiles (i.e., as happened in the case of the widow from Zarephath and the Syrian Naaman). Nevertheless, it also attempts to persuade the implied reader concerning the identity of Jesus.¹⁷ As such, the implied reader is predisposed to process the speech with two elements in the foreground: the speech will provide additional detail relevant to the construction of Jesus’ characterization, and it will elicit a new understanding of the two LXX examples that are cited.

Processing of the speech is initially analeptic and then proleptic; a to-and-fro movement between text and reader generating meaning from the narrative continuum.¹⁸ There are a number of components in terms of rhetorical arrangement that steer the implied reader in the identification of narrative trajectories. In particular,

¹⁶Though much has been added in the past decade or more, for a detailed bibliographical overview, see Schreck, “Nazareth Pericope,” 399-471. Most recently, see Neiryneck, “Luke 4,16-30,” 357-95.

¹⁷If viewed from a theological standpoint, the former is soteriological in focus, whereas the latter is christological in scope.

¹⁸See Iser, *Prospecting*, 31-41, for a more detailed explanation of the “to-and-fro” movement that occurs between text and reader.

the statement of case (4.22-23) provides the implied reader with the purpose of the speech and thus the funnel for understanding its overarching rhetorical argument: *contra* the well-known Greco-Roman proverb that Jesus cites – “Physician, heal yourself” (4.22) – he will not be doing the expected course of “religious” patronage.¹⁹ Delay in specifying the deeds Jesus conferred in Capernaum to the section following the speech (4.31-32) by the implied author provides rhetorical amplification, thereby further accentuating the point of the statement of case: the implied reader must wait to fill the “gap” in the discourse – that is, Jesus will *not* afford the same patronage to his relatives and hometown as was shown to those in Capernaum – until the speech is complete. This *topos* of patronage beyond ethnic and kinship boundaries forms part of a core of the plot line – “salvation to the ends of the earth” – whereby Jesus and his followers go beyond ethnographical and spatial boundaries to proclaim “salvation” to all of humankind.²⁰ Indeed, the implied reader draws an intratextual link between the closing scene of Acts (28.17-31) and Jesus’ hometown synagogue speech (Lk 4.16-

¹⁹However cf. Richard L. Rohrbaugh, “Legitimizing Sonship – A Test of Honour: A social-scientific study of Luke 4:1-30,” in *Modelling Early Christianity*, 183-97, who argues that the synagogue crowd’s quip to Jesus was offensive, and thus the reason for his combative response.

²⁰For a different understanding of the topographical movement in Luke-Acts, *contra* what is typically held in terms of construing movement towards Rome as movement to “the ends of the earth,” see Loveday C.A. Alexander, “Narrative Maps: Reflections on the Toponymy of Acts,” in *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*, ed. M.D. Carroll, D.J.A. Clines, and P.R. Davies (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 200; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 17-57. Alexander contends the topographical movement in Luke-Acts towards Rome reflects an extratextual repertoire that held Rome to be the center of the earth and places the exotic in the eastern reaches of the Roman empire. Accordingly, the reading location of the implied reader (or perhaps more accurately here the authorial audience) – likely more affiliated with connotations of Rome versus Jerusalem – suggests that the implied reader construes the movement of the salvific proclamation as reaching its climax in Rome as a movement towards the reading location of the implied reader. However cf. Ps(s) Sol. 8.16 in which Rome is portrayed as being at the “end of the earth.”

30). As a result, though certainly not the only narrative mechanism that prompts this connection, the implied reader – through analeptic processing – construes the speech as a framing device from which to understand the narrative discourse.²¹

With the body of the speech (4.24-27), the discourse takes on meaning for the implied reader on two different levels (via the narrative world and the world of the reader). Specifically, Jesus' actions in moving the boundaries of "salvation" beyond his relatives and hometown represents the *topos* of proclamation to the Jewish people throughout Luke-Acts. Of course, at this juncture in the narrative, the implied reader does not have knowledge to generate this meaning; it is only in the "to-and-fro" interaction between text and reader that such occurs – an analeptic activity. Regardless, the implied reader is in an omniscient position – *contra* characters and character groups within the narrative world – with the vantage to make judgments concerning the actions and words of characters and character groups. Consequently, the two examples from the LXX form a hermeneutical framework from which the implied reader evaluates subsequent characters and character groups (i.e., do their actions and speech place them in the same character type?).

3.2 Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization

The initial speech in the Galilean ministry provides significant detail around the characterization of Jesus and the characterization of those who oppose him as well as

²¹Perhaps the first to note the numerous echoes between Lk 4.16-30 and Acts 28.17-31 is Jacques Dupont, "La conclusion des Actes et son rapport à l'ensemble de l'ouvrage de Luc," in *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, ed. J. Kremer (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium, 48; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978) 359-404. More recently, see Alexander, "Back to Front," 419-46, esp. 433-36, who notes the connections and argues that both Acts 28.17-31 and Lk 1.1-4.30 function as framing devices for the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts.

those who embrace his message. These modes of characterization extend to the conclusion of the narrative in Acts.

3.2.1 Details on Jesus' Characterization

A christological trajectory emerges in the speech, producing additional background for the implied reader to draw upon in developing Jesus' characterization. The composition of Jesus' *ethos* includes: (1) Jesus' ministry and words parallel those of Elijah and Elisha, and thus he is to be considered as a prophet in the same lineage (i.e., he narrowly and miraculously escapes death and preaches to both Jews and Gentiles); (2) Jesus is blessed with the Spirit of God to proclaim "salvation" to the disenfranchised; (3) Jesus goes against cultural protocols in the bestowal of salvific patronage – showing no nepotism to those from his ethnographic origination; and (4) Jesus is considered a skilled orator, at least by his relatives and hometown (4.22: "... gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth"). All four of these trajectories carry forward in the discourse of Luke-Acts; the result is rhetorical amplification. Specifically, the first two trajectories are found in the earlier narrative discourse;²² therefore their reference in the first speech of the Galilean ministry serves as a form of amplification, as the implied author accentuates certain character traits embodied by Jesus.

²²For the first trajectory (i.e., placement of Jesus in the prophetic lineage), cf. among Lk 1.46-56 (a hypertext of 1 Sam 2.1-10) and 2.52 (a hypertext of 1 Sam 2.21, 26); for the second trajectory, cf. among Lk 3.21-22; 4.1, 14. Hypertext is a heuristic construct used as the descriptor for the text upon which the earlier text – designated as hypotext – is grafted. Hypertextuality is mode of intertextuality in which two or more texts are linked without direct citation (specifically, see Genette, *Palimpsests*, 5-15).

3.2.2 Jesus' Hometown Synagogue and Those Who Repudiate "Salvation"

The implied author, in the characterization of Jesus' relatives and hometown, prompts the implied reader to equate them with those in Israel's past – namely, those who rejected and persecuted the prophets of old such as Elijah and Elisha and who were condemned by the Deuteronomist. The repudiation of those whose positions of honor are threatened by the extension of "salvation" to those in the religious and social margins (i.e., those embodying "shame" in various senses) forms a tangential *topos* that compliments the narrative plot line. The latter serves as a characterization matrix for the implied reader, wherefore those characters or character groups who retain religious and social systems of honor at the expense of salvific proclamation are associated with the character type represented by Jesus' relatives and hometown and, in addition – based on the examples contained in the body (4.24-27) – with those who opposed the ministries and messages of Elijah and Elisha. As the narrative moves forward, the implied reader accumulates other characters and character groups that fall into the same mode of representation. As mentioned in chapter seven and as will be demonstrated in greater detail later in this chapter, the fourth Galilean speech serves as a four-fold interpretive grid in terms of providing the implied reader with a matrix for evaluating individual characters and character groups. In this context, Jesus' relatives and hometown coincide with the first sowing example: those who have the "word" taken from them by the devil before they can act upon it (Lk 8.12).

3.3 Narrative Trajectories Engender *Topoi*

The rhetorical texture of the first speech elicits a number of *topoi* that corroborate and concurrently help move the plot along. In particular, these function as

framing mechanisms to which the implied reader supplements additional detail through processing of later elaboration in the narrative discourse. The citation of Isa 61.1-2 and 58.6 as the basis for the introduction (4.18-19) and intertextual use of 2 Kgs 5.1-14 and 1 Kgs 17.17-24, which serve as the argument for the body of the speech, are widely recognized as programmatic to the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts. The sequencing of action in the episode also plays a key role in the implied reader's demarcation of *topoi*.

3.3.1 *Forgiveness of Sin and Jubilee Legislation*

There is a rich intertextual background for the content of the LXX citation in the introduction; the poor, the captive, the blind, and the oppressed are recipients of either direct or indirect – that is, through a divine agent – divine deliverance.²³ The repetition of ἄφεσις (“release”) – via the redactional meshing of Isa 61.1-2 and 58.6 – functions as a rhetorical marker for the implied reader, accentuating the relevance of the internal occurrences of ἄφεσις in Luke-Acts, where it is used to designate “forgiveness” of sins: Lk 5.20; 24.47; Acts 2.38; 5.31; 10.43; 13.38; 26.18. Sin, within this context, takes on social implications via the encumbrances that “imprison” and “oppress” characters (i.e., as denoted by the accusative prepositions of ἄφεσις in both clauses). Analeptic processing of the narrative discourse results in the implied reader identifying the disposition and actions of certain characters as representative of the connotations that form around both encumbrances; the implied reader, therefore, construes them as a negative stereotype.

²³As noted by Roth, *Character Types*, 80-141.

Through permutation in the pattern of recitation – the first three clauses address specific entities (i.e., the captives, the blind, and the oppressed), whereas the final clause does not identify a group of recipients – the narrative discourse, through its actualization by the implied reader, takes on further social implications. In particular, the final clause serves as an interpretive key for the implied reader by means of its intertextual connections with Jubilee legislation (e.g., Lev 25.10): the implied reader expects Jesus’ ministry and proclamation to embrace social justice (via Jubilee legislation).²⁴

The chiasmic framing of the introduction accentuates the reading of scripture at the center of the scene (i.e., v.17b parallels v.20a; cf. discussion in chapter four). The overriding *topos* is established in the form of an enthymeme (v.18a), with the commissioning and the four consecutive infinitival clauses (vv.18b-19) providing elaboration. Association of the Holy Spirit as denotative of those who proclaim “good news to the poor” – a deductive conclusion of the implied reader vis-à-vis the major premise of the enthymeme – is a *topos* upon which the implied author expands in the subsequent narrative.²⁵ The three infinitival clauses following the enthymeme provide guidance to the implied reader as to what it means to “preach good news to the poor.”²⁶ The implied reader proleptically processes the ministry and speech of Jesus in Luke and subsequently the disciples in Acts against this framework. Specifically, the

²⁴Ringe, *Biblical Jubilee*; Sloan, *Favorable Year*.

²⁵For characterization of the Holy Spirit, see, e.g., Shepherd, *Holy Spirit*; Hur, *Dynamic Reading*.

²⁶Per Roth (*Character Types*, 95-141), the three groups (i.e., the imprisoned, the blind, and the oppressed), as depicted in the infinitival clauses, are seen by the implied reader as a constellation of stereotypical character types in the LXX. Clustering of the entities serves as a rhetorical heightening device.

two LXX examples from the ministries of Elisha and Elijah provide the implied reader with a matrix from which to discern meaning; both in terms of association of the Zarephathian widow and the Syrian Naaman with stereotypical character types concerning the constellations around the “poor” and requisite actions involving the implications of “preaching good news.”

3.3.2 *A Type Scene: A Paradigm of Proclamation*

The four-fold flow of action – that is, (1) boldness of Jesus’ proclamation; (2) an antithetical response by those listening to the rhetorical discourse; (3) a “miraculous” escape by the one proclaiming the message of “salvation” from listeners seeking to inflict harm; and (4) renewed spread of “salvation” – establishes a narrative framework (or “type scene”) that is replicated in various episodes in Acts: Peter and John in Acts 3.1-4.37; Peter in Acts 10.1-12.24; Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13.13-52; Paul and Barnabas in Acts 14.8-28; Paul and Silas in Acts 16.16-40; Paul in Acts 21.17-35; Paul and his companions in Acts 27.1-28.10. Construction of this type scene prompts the implied reader to associate the ministry beginnings and message of the early church and its leaders with that of Jesus.²⁷ Accordingly, the implied reader – through analeptic processing – identifies similarities between subsequent scenes and the components of the type scene.²⁸ Of course, it is only at this point that the implied

²⁷The attempts of the Jewish antagonists to thwart Paul and Barnabas by casting them outside of the boundaries of the city or region (Antioch in Acts 13.48-52; Lystra in Acts 14.19-20) mirror the response of Jesus’ hometown synagogue in the first Galilean speech (Lk 4.16-30), who attempt to cast Jesus outside the city (ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως in Lk 4.29 compared to ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν in Acts 13.50 and ἔσυρον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως in Acts 14.19).

²⁸For an overview of type scenes, see Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 51; idem, “Annunciation Type-Scene,” 115-30.

reader – through repetition in these subsequent scenes – recognizes the presence of the four-fold “action” sequence.²⁹

4 SECOND SPEECH IN THE GALILEAN MINISTRY (LK 6.17-49)

As a whole, the second speech in the Galilean ministry is perhaps one of the most neglected sections of Luke-Acts. This is in large part due to the attention paid to its counterpart in Matthew (i.e., the Sermon on the Mount [Matt 5.3-7.29]), which is seen as largely more authentic, more rhetorically appealing, and more influential to the overall discourse of the narrative in which it is contained. My examination of the rhetorical texture of the second speech in chapter five, however, shows careful rhetorical assemblage on the part of the implied author. Even a redactional comparison of Lk 6.20-49 and Matt 5.3-7.29 evinces rhetorical formation by the implied author – with plot, characterization, and *topoi* in purview. Indeed, the second speech, just as the first speech, is programmatic to the narrative discourse, as its rhetorical texture establishes an ethical matrix from which the implied reader constructs characterization and *topoi*.

4.1 Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture

The implied author locates the speech within the context of the giving of the law at Mount Sinai (Exod 19.24; 24.3): Jesus, like Moses, descends from the mountain to deliver divine instructions (Lk 6.12-19). Consequently, the second Galilean speech takes on a function similar to that of the law for Israel. An intertext of Isa 40.3-5, which was used by John the Baptist to portend the ministry of Jesus in Lk 3.4-6,

²⁹The third part of the four-fold type scene framework undergoes permutation in the case of Stephen (Acts 7.1-8.3) in that the protagonist in purview – namely, Stephen – is not delivered from physical harm but rather receives eschatological salvation.

appears in Lk 6.17, whereby τόπου πεδινοῦ (“level plain”) prompts the implied reader to associate the second speech with the earlier pronouncement of John the Baptist;³⁰ the context for the appearance of the “salvation of God” coincides with the Isaianic tradition already noted as an intertextual referent for the implied reader. The intratext also helps set the stage for the implied reader and ties to the plot line of “salvation to the ends of the earth.” the burgeoning crowd from increasing geographical parameters serves as an indication that Jesus’ pronouncement of salvation is reaching more and more people, while concurrently increasing in spatial scope. In addition, the preceding episode in Lk 6.12-16 enshrouds the speech in the apocalyptic context of Israel’s restoration through the naming of the twelve apostles.

The identity of Jesus is not in the rhetorical foreground, unlike the first speech, but rather the ethical comportment (*ethos*) of disciples. In particular, bipolar argumentation of the introduction creates a distinct demarcation between disciples and non-disciples.

The introduction exhibits close symmetry; deviation in the fourth blessing/woe pair, where the conclusion of the blessing contains more detail than that of the woe, including two enthymemes – versus one – that are intercalated, is a rhetorical signal to the implied reader of its heightened importance to the overall narrative discourse. The statement of case sets forth the overarching thematic elements of ethical behavior, while the body of the speech delves into specifics through deductive reasoning, augmented with inductive examples at its close. In particular, the statement of case

³⁰The editorial change by the implied author, in which καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα πεδία from Isa 40.4 is changed to καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας in Lk 3.5, brings this intertext to the forefront of the aural/oral experience for the implied reader: its presence replaces its earlier erasure, thereby resulting in heightened attention by the implied reader.

includes two interrelated ethical themes that are elaborated upon in the body: the need to show unconditional patronage, even to those who repudiate traditional honor and shame mores, and the requirement to embrace all individuals, regardless of their social status and adherence to accepted honor and shame stipulations. The conclusion (6.46-49) departs from the largely deductive argument of the preceding discourse – as represented by maxims and enthymemes – through the use of rhetorical questioning, with the end result that actions rather than speech separate a disciple from a non-disciple. Rhetorical amplification occurs in the conclusion through the combination of both *synkrisis* and *ecphrasis*. Much of the rhetorical argumentation assumes an intertextual knowledge of the LXX as well as an extratextual understanding of economic and, in particular, agronomical terminology on the part of the implied reader. Also discussed in greater detail in chapter five, the implied author crafts the largely deductive argumentation – via maxims and enthymemes – so that directives are typically followed by a rationale.

4.2 Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization

While the focus of the speech is not on establishing an *ethos* for Jesus, *contra* the rhetorical discourse of the first speech, it does contain elements from which the implied reader builds characterization.³¹

4.2.1 Jesus: Embodiment of Moses, Elijah, and Elisha

The intratext presents contextual data, as discussed above, that spurs the implied reader to supplement Jesus' characterization. The most obvious is the

³¹However cf. Carruth, "Strategies of Authority," 98-115.

correspondence between his actions of seclusion on the mountain and descent to dispense teaching and the actions of Moses in Exodus (Exod 3.1-4.17; 19.3-6; 24.9-18; 33.7-11; 34.29-35). *Synkrisis* with Moses is accentuated by analeptic and proleptic activity that brings prior narrative into the foreground: Jesus, like Moses, frequently withdraws into the “wilderness” for prayerful contemplation (Lk 4.42; 5.16; 9.28; 11.1). The narrative transition (Lk 6.17-19) directly preceding the speech functions as a denouement to narrative “sandwiched” between the first and second speeches, many of which are healing scenes (the Capernaum synagogue in 4.31-37; Simon’s mother-in-law and subsequently crowds in 4.38-31; the leper in 5.12-15; the paralytic in 5.17-26; the man with a withered hand in 6.6-11). Specifically, this characterization continues to build on the earlier association of Jesus with Elijah and Elisha (both of whom are actively involved in dispensing healing) in the first Galilean speech.³² Further, Jesus’ ability to administer healing to the afflicted is construed by the implied reader as a derivation of his possession of the Holy Spirit (via the narrator’s notation that δύναμις [“power”] came forth from him in 6.19b).³³ The conclusion places Jesus in the position of patron and the large narrative audience that has gathered to listen to the speech as clients; the series of the preceding healing episodes coincide with this depiction, whereby Jesus, as the one dispensing healing, is the patron and the recipients of his healing activity are clients.

³²See Craig A. Evans, “Luke’s Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987) 75-83.

³³Cf. the use of δύναμις in association with the Holy Spirit (4.14), which serves as an intratext for the implied reader. Also, see 5.17c: “... and the power (δύναμις) of the Lord was with him to heal.”

4.2.2 *Opponents of Jesus*

As rhetorical argumentation of the second speech serves as an interpretive grid in the narrative discourse (i.e., through *synkrisis*) – in particular the deviation in the final blessing and woe pair (6.22-23 versus 6.26) – the implied reader associates Jesus' interlocutors (i.e., the Pharisee and scribes) in the cycle of five controversies sandwiched between the first and second speeches (5.17-26; 5.27-32; 5.33-39; 6.1-5; 6.6-11) as well as his relatives and hometown with the adversaries of disciples represented in the final blessing (viz., those depicted in 6.22-23). Others thus far encountered in the narrative who fall into this bucket include Herod the tetrarch, because of his imprisonment of John the Baptist (3.18-20),³⁴ and the devil (4.1-13). Proleptic activity by the implied reader results in the placement of numerous characters and character groups into this same category: the chief priest in Lk 22-23; temple authorities and Sadducees in Acts 4.1-8.1; Saul in Acts 7.58b-8.3; Jewish antagonists of Paul in Acts 13.1-28.31; Bar-Jesus in Acts 13.4-12; the owners of the slave girl in Acts 16.16-30; Demetrius the silversmith in Acts 19.23-41; the Jews from Asia, Ananias the high priest, Jewish temple leaders, and the Jewish temple tribunal in Acts 21.27-26.32.

4.2.3 *True Disciples*

Just as the implied reader develops a stereotype for characters and character groups who appear as adversaries to John the Baptist, Jesus, and their disciples, the

³⁴The characterization of Herod in Luke-Acts is the fullest in terms of adversarial/negative characters, functioning as a “foil” to John the Baptist, Jesus, and subsequently the Christian movement but also embodying many of the actions and qualities of antipathetic characters and character groups (see, Darr, *Herod the Fox*).

implied reader constructs a stereotype for characters and character groups who embrace Jesus' message; personages who embody the ethical conduct delineated in the second speech. Analeptic analysis prompts association of characters and character groups such as the various characters from the birth narratives (1.5-2.52); John the Baptist (3.1-22); Peter, John, and James (5.1-11); the friends of the paralytic (5.17-26); and Levi (5.27-32) as in compliance with the ethical behavior delineated in the speech. Likewise, proleptic reading of the narrative results in the comparison of a long series of characters and character groups with the ethical behavior of the speech.³⁵

4.3 Narrative Trajectories Engender *Topoi*

The rhetorical texture of the second speech is imbued with a number of *topoi* that serve a programmatic narrative function, demarcating actions representative of a true disciple. These are an extension of the christological *ethos* set forth in the first speech; the speech and actions of Jesus are the foundational elements underlying the ethical behavior of a disciple. Rhetorical argumentation of the speech also relates the ethical demeanor of a disciple to that of the divine (e.g., the intercalated enthymematic rationale of the first segment of the body in 6.36). This rhetorical "positioning" by the implied author places the implied reader and narrative audience in a rhetorical dilemma: failure to follow Jesus' instructions is tantamount to repudiation of the divine.

4.3.1 *Reversal of Fortunes*

The introduction of the speech imposes upon the implied reader and the narrative audience the obligation of completing the major premises for each of the

³⁵For a more detailed overview, see discussion of the fourth sowing example later in this chapter.

blessing and woe enthymemes. Each of the major premises (and conclusions for that matter) run counter to traditional Greco-Roman ideological systems, resulting in reversal of fortunes – true in both directions – a recurrent Lukan *topos*.³⁶ Through analeptic reading the implied reader finds that such is present in the prior characterization of Elizabeth and Mary (1.5-2.21), the two LXX examples Jesus cites in the first speech (4.24-27), and the healing activities of Jesus’ ministry (i.e., in that all of the recipients of “salvation” are from the social and religious margins). Through proleptic activity the implied reader finds that reversal of fortunes is integral to the plot throughout the remainder of the narrative; the culmination being that Paul’s imprisonment – in effect – diminishes from view in the closing scene of Acts (cf. 28.30: “And he remained there two whole years at his own expense [ἐν ἰδίῳ].”). Though not as prevalent, the opposite reversal of fortunes – that is, from positions of honor to that of shame – also occurs in the narrative (e.g, Simon the Pharisee in Lk 7.36-50; the profligate son in Lk 15.11-32; the rich man in Lk 16.19-31; the demise of Herod in Acts 12.20-23).

4.3.2 *Material Benefaction*

There is an overriding focus on the use of economic (or material) means in the allotment of salvation in the statement of case and body of the speech. Indeed, the implied author assumes that the extratextual repertoire of the implied reader includes familiarity with economic benefaction, including accompanying terminology (e.g., χάρις and μισθός; οἰκτίρμονες; μετρόν; κόλπος). This is buttressed by the *topos* of the statement of case – the subject matter for its enthymematic argument is predicated

³⁶York, *Reversal in Luke*, *passim*.

within economic realities.³⁷ This concern for wealth and poverty is not new to the narrative; the implied reader draws connections with earlier narrative through analeptic echoes that include the Magnificat (1.46-56), connotations of poverty surrounding Jesus' birth (2.1-20), the preaching of John the Baptist (3.10-14), the first speech of the Galilean ministry (4.16-30), and the call of the first disciples (5.1-11). Wealth and poverty, in particular, become increasingly important in the narrative with the progression of the plot line; disciples are to assume roles of benefaction to help elevate those in poverty to modes of new existence.³⁸

4.3.3 *A New Mode of Benefaction: Ethical Comportment of Disciples*

The *topos* of reversal of fortunes in the introduction lays a hermeneutical framework for the implied reader and narrative audience; Jesus' teaching and actions reinterpret traditional social and religious ideological systems, with the recipients of "salvation" being the disenfranchised. Use of the second-person address throughout the speech prompts the implied reader and the narrative audience to envision disciples as assuming the responsibility of enacting Jesus' salvific message. The rhetorical argument of the speech posits two interrelated *topoi* – ethical frameworks from which

³⁷As corroboration, note that the Lukan implied author modifies the "spiritual" blessings found in the blessings of the Matthean Sermon on the Mount to represent matters of wealth and poverty (Lk 6.20-26).

³⁸For a discussion of wealth and poverty in Luke-Acts, see Luke T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 39; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977); Kyoung-Jin Kim, *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 155; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Joel B. Green, "Good News to Whom? Jesus and the 'Poor' in the Gospel of Luke," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994) 59-74; David L. Balch, "Rich and Poor, Proud and Humble in Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*, ed. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 214-33; Moxnes, *Economy*.

disciples interact with other individuals and groups: (1) the need to show benefaction to those who obviate patronal boundaries (versus adverse reciprocity), and (2) the requisite to extend benefaction to those outside of the boundaries of kinship and companionship and moreover to those without the means to reciprocate.³⁹ The implied reader and narrative audience engender both of these *topoi* via the statement of case (the first *topos* from 6.27c-29 and the second *topos* from 6.30) and subsequent elaboration in the body (the first *topos* from the first segment [vv.32-36] and the second *topos* from the second segment [vv.37-42]).

To-and-fro activity of the implied reader in processing the narrative in its entirety generates overarching thematic threads as well as meaning from each episode where one or both of the *topoi* are present. Indeed, much of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts is intertwined with these two interrelated ethical dimensions. The implied reader, therefore, construes the speech and actions of characters and character groups – both analeptically and proleptically – based on their conformity or nonconformity with the stipulations contained therein. Both also play a key role in helping to drive along the plot line of “salvation to the ends of the earth.” As such, based on preceding narrative, the implied reader already associates the social and religious marginal as recipients of salvific benefaction. As the narrative progresses and the plot line unfolds towards its final destination the number of recipients of salvific activity concurrently burgeons. Further, the implied reader constructs a more and more detailed view of the

³⁹Cf. Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, “Fathers and Houscholders in the Jesus Movement: The Perspective of the Gospel of Luke,” *Biblical Interpretation* 11 (2003) 211-38. They, through examination of household social codes, pinpoint household patronage without reciprocity as a *topos* encompassed by the Lukan model of discipleship.

specifics of ethical behavior – as defined by salvific benefaction – through the actualization of subsequent episodes.

4.3.4 *Discipleship Equals Action*

Movement beyond simply hearing Jesus' instructions to putting them into action permeates much of the rhetorical argument of the second speech. Ambiguity around the identity of the disciples listening to Jesus' words at the beginning of the speech is engendered by the implied author. (The implied reader is not given any information as to the individuals or groups comprising the designation "disciples" [6.20a].) The implied reader fills this "gap" in the processing of the speech, in which actions – through rhetorical movement – are seen as an integral part of discipleship. The conclusion brings this rhetorical *topos* to its apex through *synkrisis* (which also takes the form of *ecphrasis*) of the two builders; those who enact Jesus' directives build a house that will withstand the onslaught of flood waters, whereas those who fail to do so build a house that will experience destruction. The implied author has already conveyed the importance of ethical actions in preaching of the John the Baptist (3.1-14) and the calling of the first disciples (5.1-11). The centrality of this *topos* intensifies as Jesus progresses towards Jerusalem; it serves as a means for the implied reader to decipher disciples versus non-disciples. Characters and character groups such as the lawyer and the Good Samaritan (Lk 10.25-37), the dishonest steward (Lk 16.1-13), the rich ruler (Lk 18.18-30), the poor widow (Lk 21.1-4), the early Jerusalem community (Acts 2.41-47; 4.32-37), Barnabas (Acts 4.32-37), Ananias and Saphira (Acts 5.1-11), the response of the Christian community to Agabus' prophecy of famine (Acts 11.27-30), among others are evaluated by the implied reader based on whether

or not their faith embodies action. Ongoing elaboration is found in Jesus' teaching as well; for example, the instructions Jesus gives to the seventy "missionaries" (Lk 10.1-16) concentrate on actions versus speech.

4.3.5 *Ethical Actions Derive from the Heart*

Derivation of ethical behavior from the καρδία ("heart") – and for that matter discernment that coincides with the ideological position of the implied author of Luke-Acts – is another *topos* that emanates from the speech. Interestingly, inclusion of the *topos* is expressed alongside economic terminology – θησαυρός (i.e., a material equated with wealth)⁴⁰ – and as the final enthymemic example of the body (6.45). This heightens the importance of the *topos* to the implied reader. The actions of those who embody Jesus' teaching as well as those who are opposed to the new religious and social order he preaches originate from the inner being of a person. Ethical transformation that conforms with or recalcitrant actions that contest Jesus' teaching on the new religious and social order stem from cognitive activity. The implied reader has already encountered instances of the two cognitive options in the preceding narrative and draws upon the enthymematic argument behind the *topos* to make certain determinations about prior characterization. When construed in combination with the two preceding agronomical enthymematic examples (6.43-44), the implied reader concludes that those who resist Jesus' message have evil hearts (and are to be equated with thorns and bramble bushes), while those who listen and enact Jesus' instructions have good hearts (and are to be equated with fig trees and grape vines). This *topos* continues to play an important role throughout the remainder of the narrative,

⁴⁰Cf. the usage of θησαυρός in Lk 12.33-34; 18.22.

extending all of the way to the closing scene of Acts in the citation from Isa 6.9-10 (Acts 28.27). In particular, the four character taxonomies established in the fourth speech, which will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, provide the interpretive framework for the implied reader; those characters and character groups who fall into the first three sowing taxonomies have – to varying extents – evil hearts, whereas those who coincide with the fourth sowing taxonomy have good hearts. In this context, those with evil hearts ultimately fail to embody the ethical dimensions of Jesus’ message, whereas those with good hearts exemplify the disposition and behavior of Jesus’ message.

5 THIRD SPEECH OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY (7.24-35)

The third speech of the Galilean ministry is replete with skillful rhetorical arrangement. Many scholars fail to equate Jesus’ instructions as oratory on the basis that the episode is not a coherent whole (viz., because of the narrative aside separating the statement of proof and body in 7.29-30). Consequently, the speech is rarely examined in its entirety but rather from a focus on redactional and source-critical issues behind the text. My earlier investigation of the rhetorical texture of the speech demonstrates that it exhibits significant rhetorical coherence when examined as an amplified chreia, however, with the narrative aside serving as an interpretive key for the implied reader.

5.1 Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture

The rhetorical argument of the speech prompts the implied reader to make certain judgments concerning the *ethos* (viz., characterization) of John the Baptist and

Jesus through the implied author's use of *ecphrasis* and *synkrisis*.⁴¹ Their characterization contributes to the plot line in that the implied author repudiates the accusations of Jewish adversaries; the rhetorical argument shows the specious nature of the accusations being cast upon John the Baptist and Jesus and moreover aligns both with the divine will. Ironic dissonance is created by the implied author through the use of the narrative aside (7.29-30): the implied reader is privy to information not available to the narrative audience, data that predisposes the implied reader to view the Pharisees and lawyers in a negative manner.

The two episodes following the second speech (7.1-10; 7.11-17) give rise to the query from John the Baptist, through his disciples, to Jesus regarding his *ethos* (7.18-23). This preceding contextual evidence establishes the *ethos* of Jesus and, with the implied reader's processing of the statement of case (7.28), the *ethos* of John the Baptist – specifically, the relationship of Jesus and John the Baptist – as the *topos* of the speech. The two prior episodes (7.1-10 and 7.11-17) evoke *synkrisis* and prompt the implied reader to draw parallels between Jesus' ministry and that of Elijah and Elisha – through intratextual linkages with the body of the first speech (4.24-27) and the intertextual type scenes in 7.1-10 (healing of the centurion's servant; cf. 2 Kgs 5.19) and 7.11-17 (the raising of a widow's dead son at Nain; cf. 1 Kgs 17.10-24; 2 Kgs 4.32-37).⁴² The amplified chreia preceding the speech – specifically the chreia (7.21) and its paraphrase (7.22) – provides the implied reader with analeptic referents to the first speech (4.18-19, 24-27), where Jesus' ministry (the character stereotypes

⁴¹See Cameron, "Characterizations in the Gospels," 35-69.

⁴²Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 282-93; Kearney, *Principal Compositional Techniques*.

spelled out in the chreia and its paraphrase) extends to those personages and groups on the religious and social marginal.⁴³

The rhetorical style of the speech reflects attentive construction by the implied author. The introduction (7.24-27) presents a three-fold series of rhetorical questioning that repeats the same question with a different answer following each.⁴⁴ The only difference between the three rhetorical questions is in the answer to the first question; the answer is not followed with a rebuttal as in the case of the second and third questions-answers (cf. 7.25b, 26b-27). The rhetorical questioning reaches a crescendo with the third question and answer – a rhetorical effect that garners the attention of the implied reader.

The identity of John the Baptist is already known by the implied reader through prior intratextual information (1.16-17, 76) – Elijah – to which the narrative audience is not privy. This information chasm enables the implied reader to make judgments concerning the narrative audience and their reactions to the messages and ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus. Heightening of the rhetorical address to the narrative audience occurs through redactional modifications of the intertextual citation from Mal 3.1 and Exod 23.20 by the implied author at the close of the introduction (7.27); specifically, the changes from the third person to second person raise the response of the narrative audience to John the Baptist (as specified in the narrative aside in 7.29-30) to the rhetorical foreground.

⁴³See Roth, *Character Types*, esp. 80-206.

⁴⁴Expolitio (viz., lingering on the same *topos*) has the rhetorical effect of amplification (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.54).

The statement of case (7.28) exhibits sophisticated enthymematic construction that includes culling of analeptic activity by the implied reader – namely, the conception of John the Baptist (1.5-25; 3.21-22), the identity of his disciples (3.8), and his relationship to Jesus (1.26-38). The dual enthymemes of the body (7.31-34) demarcate the *ethos* of all three, with Jesus and his disciples conceived of the divine, yet John the Baptist through natural means (i.e., “born of a woman”). The result for the implied reader is that Jesus and his disciples receive greater status than John the Baptist and his disciples. Notwithstanding, the *ethos* of Jesus, John the Baptist, and their disciples stands in contradistinction to the *ethos* of the Pharisees and lawyers, which is revealed in the narrative aside (7.29-30).

Inclusion of the narrative assessment of characters (7.28-30) that appeared in an earlier episode (3.1-18) is a narrative maneuver by the implied author that has the effect of rhetorical heightening. Interestingly, those characters extolled by the narrator in the narrative aside are noted as comprising part of the narrative audience – that is, the people and tax collectors – who came out to hear the message preached by John the Baptist, while those condemned by the narrator – namely, the Pharisees and lawyers – are not mentioned as being present. The implied reader, therefore, is prompted by the implied author to search for data that will enable the “filling” of this narrative gap; analeptic activity brings prior episodes involving the Pharisees and lawyers into the foreground. Indeed, the one episode where both are found together is the first instance in the Lukan narrative where Jesus’ preaching and actions are outwardly contested (5.17-26).

The body (7.31-34) returns to the stylistic mode of rhetorical questioning, as found in the introduction (7.24-27). Intertextual echoes to the rebellious, hard-hearted

people of the LXX – engendered by the inclusion of “members of this generation” (7.31) – predisposes the implied reader to construe the comparative corollary – namely, “children” (7.32) – in a unfavorable manner. In addition, rhetorical juxtaposition of the actions of John the Baptist and Jesus (7.33-34), when coupled with the interpretative conclusions derived from the preceding dual enthymeme (7.31-32), demonstrates the lack of *logos* behind the accusations of their interlocutors.

Use of τέκνον versus παιδίον in the conclusion (7.35) as a designation for “children” (the latter is employed in the dual enthymeme of the body [7.32]) serves as a rhetorical device; the implied reader and the narrative audience are prodded to differentiate between the identity of the two: the former denotes those who reject John the Baptist and Jesus, while the latter represents those who embrace them. In particular, the latter occurs as a result of the chiasmic linkage between the first part of the narrative aside – “tax collectors and all of the people *justified* God” (7.29) – and the conclusion – “wisdom is *justified* by her children” (7.35). Precise identification of those who enact the directives of John the Baptist and subsequently Jesus is left open by the implied author through the use of λαός in the narrative aside (7.29-30) – an open-ended designation to which nearly any character or character group might correspond. (Indeed, the sinful woman who comes to Jesus at the house of Simon the Pharisee in the episode following the speech [7.36-50], per the interpretive grid the implied reader constructs, is understood as one of the “children” [τέκνον] who justifies God.) This mode of rhetorical argumentation coincides with the technique known as

insinuatio, whereby a rhetorician would approach a difficult rhetorical problem in an indirect manner.⁴⁵

5.2 Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization

The rhetorical invention and style of the speech place *ethos* in the foreground for the implied reader. *Contra* the preceding speech in 6.20-49, which serves as an interpretive grid for the implied reader to evaluate characters and character groups based on their actions, the third speech (7.24-35), which includes the preceding amplified chreia (7.18-23), focuses on the characterization of Jesus and John the Baptist. Characterization extends to the Pharisees and lawyers through their opposition to Jesus in preceding episodes (5.17-26) and the narrator's intrusion into the speech through the narrative aside (7.29-30). The most impugning aspect of their characterization revolves around the fallacies embedded within their *logos* against Jesus and John the Baptist. Rhetorical accentuation occurs here in that the implied author prods the implied reader to construct coherence from the rhetorical texture of the speech, a rhetorical achievement not possible through the direct dissemination of information regarding the *ethos* of the Pharisees and lawyers. Of course, ultimately, characters and character groups whose actions embrace those of Jesus and John the Baptist are viewed in a positive light by the implied reader, while those whose thoughts and actions coincide with those of the Pharisees and lawyers are associated in a negative light.

⁴⁵Insinuatio is discussed in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.6.9-1.6.11; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 4.1.42-4.1.50.

5.2.1 *Characterization of John the Baptist*

The character of John the Baptist plays an important role in the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts. The beginnings of the narrative in Luke (1.5-2.52) provide the implied reader with an analeptic reference for the *synkrisis* of John the Baptist and Jesus. Parallelism in the characterization of the two is not one of equals: the implied author – as evinced by the rhetorical structuring of the narrative discourse – places Jesus in a position of greater prominence than John the Baptist: (1) Jesus' birth story receives almost twice as much space as that of John the Baptist; (2) two prophetic responses follow Jesus' presentation in the temple (that of Simeon in 2.22-35 and that of Anna in 2.36-38) compared to one for John the Baptist (that of Zechariah in 1.67-79); (3) the bulk of narrative attention is given to Mary versus Elizabeth when the two meet in 1.39-56; (4) Jesus is "Son of the Most High" but John the Baptist is "prophet of the Most High" (1.32, 76); and (5) John the Baptist, not Jesus, leaps in the womb when Elizabeth and Mary meet (1.41).⁴⁶ This continues in the rhetorical argument of the third speech of the Galilean ministry, in which Jesus and now his disciples are placed in a position above John the Baptist and his disciples (cf. the statement of case in 7.28). Prioritization of Jesus' disciples over John the Baptist is new for the implied reader; coherence continues to form around the characterization of John the Baptist through rhetorical *synkrisis*.⁴⁷

⁴⁶See Green, *Theology of the Gospel*, 54.

⁴⁷The implied author pays significant attention to John the Baptist throughout both Luke and Acts, with the *synkrisis* of Jesus and John the Baptist (Lk 1.5-2.52; 3.1-20; 7.29-30; Acts 13.24-25) or that of their disciples (Acts 18.25; 19.1-4) always in the foreground of the narrative discourse.

The third speech provides the implied reader with significant detail that is used to construct meaning around the characterization of John the Baptist and his disciples. Despite the implied author – through rhetorical argument – placing Jesus and his disciples above John the Baptist and his disciples, the overarching characterization is positive. Expansion of Jesus’ ministry to a larger geographical, ethnographical, and social matrix prompts the inquiry, evidence that John the Baptist and his disciples associate Jesus’ ministry and message with the awaited Messiah. In particular, correspondence between Jesus and Elijah and Elisha via the two preceding scenes (7.1-10 and 7.11-17) prompts the query from John, an alignment between the ideological locations of the implied author and John the Baptist and his disciples. The inquisitive question from John the Baptist and his disciples serves as an interpretive framework for other characters and character groups in the narrative that approach Jesus and subsequently his disciples regarding matters of dispute in an inquisitive manner: Zachaeus (Lk 19.1-10); Gamaliel (Acts 5.33-42); the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8.26-39); the initial response from the Jews of Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13.13-43); the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.1-29); Lydia (Acts 16.11-15); the Jews of Beroea (Acts 17.10-12); the Athenians (Acts 17.16-34), among others. The ripostes to the first two questions that Jesus poses to the crowd concerning John the Baptist are ironic in that the descriptions of John the Baptist are the very opposite of what the implied reader knows about him based on preceding narrative: the *ethos* and *logos* of John the Baptist is unwavering (e.g., he was sent to prison for his condemnation of Herod [3.18-20]) and his message runs counter to the lifestyle of the wealthy (viz., those who would clothe themselves in “soft clothing” [3.7-14]). Hence, though the implied author does

not include a response from the crowd to Jesus' initial two queries, the implied reader fills the narrative "gap" with a definitive "no" in both instances.

5.2.2 *Characterization of Jesus*

Contra the first speech, christological ramifications of Jesus' characterization are largely not in purview in the case of the third speech, though the first and third speeches are intertwined with the answer Jesus gives to the disciples of John the Baptist (7.22-23; cf. 4.18-19). This answer is actually at the heart of Jesus' characterization in the speech; the accusations Jesus notes are being cited against him (7.34) parallel the answer he gave to the disciples of John the Baptist (7.21-22), hearkening back to the introduction of the first speech (4.18-19): Jesus is not an ascetic (something associated with John the Baptist) and embraces a ministry that brings relief to those on the social margins. The other aspect of Jesus' characterization was already discussed: the rhetorical argumentation of the speech places Jesus and his disciples above John the Baptist and his disciples in terms of importance.

5.2.3 *Characterization of the Pharisees and Lawyers*

Prior narrative discourse represents the Pharisees and lawyers as opposing Jesus' words and ministry. The narrative aside (7.29-30) discloses to the implied reader that their opposition even extends to John the Baptist and his disciples. The rhetorical construction of the speech – specifically the conclusion (7.35) – prompts the implied reader to equate tax collectors and sinners with the children (τέκνον) of God and the Pharisees and lawyers, at least in the context of the narrative discourse until this point, as outside of the parameters of children of God. Just as the Pharisees and lawyers oppose Jesus in prior episodes because of his embrace of those from the social and

religious margin and repudiation of Jewish legal traditions, the rhetorical argument of the body (7.31-34) prods the implied reader to associate those who reject Jesus and John the Baptist (i.e., announce that John the Baptist has a demon and that Jesus is a glutton and drunkard) with the Pharisees and lawyers. Regardless, despite their confluence in the third speech, the implied author seemingly demarcates separate characterization of both Pharisees and lawyers: Jesus' subsequent pronounced remonstrance against the Pharisees (11.37-42) and the lawyers (11.45-52) engenders two distinct characterizations. Nonetheless, characterization of the lawyers is closed for the implied reader,⁴⁸ whereas, as previously argued in chapters two and eight, characterization of the Pharisees contains possible "cracks" – particularly the few who are named by the implied author (viz., Simon in Lk 7.36-50; Joseph of Arimathea in Lk 23.50-56; Gamaliel in Acts 5.33-42).

The body (7.31-34) establishes a *topos* – stereotypical behavior for those who oppose Jesus – that extends to the end of Acts. In particular, scattered throughout the narrative discourse (both analeptically and proleptically) are episodes where interlocutors – primarily comprised of the Pharisees – attempt to push Jesus to embrace their ideological systems (or at least "confirm" his ideological system) or entrap him in situations where he is in violation (of those systems). (The latter increases into the foreground and the latter recedes into the background as the narrative progresses.) The narrative takes on allegorical meaning for the implied reader: Jesus' – and to a lesser extent John the Baptist's – rejection of traditional ideological beliefs corresponds with the refusals to dance and weep.

⁴⁸"Lawyers" (νομικός) appear in a select number of instances in Luke (and not at all in Acts) in a very negative light (5.17-26; 7.29-30; 10.25-37; 11.45-52; 14.1-24).

5.2.4 Characterization of All the People and the Tax Collectors

“All the people and tax collectors” via the chiasmic use of δικαιόω stand in contradistinction to the “Pharisees and lawyers” (cf. 7.29 and 7.35). The former group is an open-ended, ambiguous designation that enables the implied reader to associate characters and character groups who arise in the narrative as “children of God.” In particular, certainly familiar with the story of the Israelite people – as contained in Exodus and Deuteronomy – from which the intertextual echo “members of this generation” derives (Exod 32.9; 33.3, 5; Deut 10.16), the implied reader knows that not all were considered as faithless and further the journey of faith was ongoing; the result being that “all the people” (πᾶς ὁ λαός) is envisioned by the implied reader as an open referent. This rhetorical tactic allows the implied reader to present characters and character groups that exhibit varying degrees of faithfulness and coincide with the various taxonomic sowing categories presented in the final speech of the Galilean ministry (8.4-18).

5.3 Narrative Trajectories Engender *Topoi*

The rhetorical situation of the third speech is established by the questioning from John the Baptist and his disciples regarding Jesus’ *ethos* and Jesus’ response. The latter comprises part of a larger amplified chreia (7.18-23) that summarizes Jesus’ ministry – from which the implied reader engenders analeptic connections. It not only builds upon the two previous narrative summaries of Jesus’ ministry in 4.18-19 and 6.17-19 but actual incidents where benefaction has become a reality in Jesus’ ministry (and will become in terms of proleptic connections): cleansing of the unclean and

demonic possessed (4.31-37; 5.12-16), healing of the sick (4.38-39, 40-42; 5.17-26; 6.6-11; 7.1-10), and resurrection of the dead (7.11-17).⁴⁹ Further, the content of the summaries combined forms an intertextual matrix with the LXX from which the implied reader deduces a constellation of stereotypical characters: entities on the outer edges of social and religious systems.⁵⁰ The implied reader, as a result, does not construe Jesus' benefaction to different characters throughout the narrative as individual acts but rather as part of a larger *topos*: Jesus delivers benefaction to characters and character groups on the social and religious margin that brings them back within the parameters of honor (i.e., those characters and character groups are viewed by the narrative audience and implied reader as shameful).

The final part of Jesus' response to the query from John the Baptist and his disciples posits another *topos* (7.23: "And blessed is the one who takes no offense at me"): characters and character groups are defined by the narrative discourse vis-à-vis their response to Jesus and subsequently the Christian movement. This is evident in an assortment of instances in the narrative, where the implied author withholds definitive judgment of certain characters or character groups because they refrain from renouncing Jesus or his disciples. Several of the more notable examples include Jesus' instructions to the seventy-two disciples in Lk 10.1-12; Gamaliel in Acts 5.33-42; Gallio, proconsul of Achaia, in Acts 18.12-17; and Agrippa and Bernice in Acts 25.13-26.32.

⁴⁹There is a progression in the miraculous benefaction of Jesus prior to the third speech, with the incident involving the raising of the widow's son at Nain (7.11-17) as the final episode before the amplified chreia (7.18-23) preceding the speech.

⁵⁰See Roth, *Character Types*, 95-141.

6 **FOURTH SPEECH OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY (8.4-18)**

The final speech in the Galilean ministry (8.4-18) has received recent attention within its Markan context, with rhetorical, narrative, and readerly analysis showing it to be a pivotal element to the narrative discourse – providing an interpretive matrix from which the implied reader construes characterization.⁵¹ My contention is that it serves a similar function in the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts, building on earlier character grids provided by the implied author (primarily found in the three preceding Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus); the implied author does so by guiding the implied reader to construct four character taxonomies based on the four sowing results. In addition, redactional comparison of the speech within its Markan and Lukan contexts shows a heightened interest by the implied author of Luke-Acts on “doing” (ποιέω) and the actual production of “fruit” (καρπός).

6.1 **Constructing Meaning from the Rhetorical Texture**

There is a significant amount of contextual information supplied by the implied author in the speech. Jesus continues to attract growing crowds of curious followers, per comments from the narrator prior to the speech (8.4), an entity that is larger in mass than the one that assembled for the second speech (6.17-19). In terms of rhetorical context, benefaction is at the forefront via the preceding episode at the house of Simon the Pharisee (7.36-50) and the transition summary (8.1-3). The sinful woman, in lieu of the hospitality expected of Simon as a host, shows hospitality in the

⁵¹Especially, Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 148-63; eadem, “Builds Character,” 347-57.

lavishness of her actions⁵² and receives salvific benefaction from him in return. The women disciples who were traveling with Jesus and the twelve apostles and had received healing benefaction from Jesus provide material benefaction to Jesus and the twelve apostles. Both instances corroborate the *topos* established earlier in the second speech of the Galilean ministry in that the benefaction is given without expectation of reciprocity.

The implied author employs a rhetorical style of repetition that accentuates “hearing” as the thematic center to the speech, though disciples, via the rhetorical argument, must go beyond “hearing” to action. Further, earlier in the narrative – in the second speech (6.20-49) – the implied author delineates significant detail on the ideological and behavioral systems of disciples. The fourth speech builds upon these interpretive frameworks, demarcating taxonomies into which the implied reader places characters and character groups.

The introduction (8.5-8a) consists of a parabolic example rooted in agrarian culture. Its lack of attention to details of planting and tilling is a possible indication to the implied reader that the aim of the rhetorical invention is on the outcome of the activity. The introduction abounds in repetition that climaxes with the fourth example, which employs homoeoteleuton for added emphasis. Repetition serves to accentuate the different consequences of the sowing activity as represented by the four prepositions παρά, ἐπί, ἐν μέσῳ, and εἰς. The first three instances fail to penetrate the surface of the soil, which likely contributes to their failure to produce fruit, whereas

⁵²The initial reaction of the implied reader and narrative audience is the same regarding the actions of the sinful women: she shamelessly exhibits sexual advances towards Jesus by taking down her hair and then fondling his feet (see, e.g., Kathleen E. Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition* [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993] 124-25; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 305-15).

the fourth penetrates the soil, undergoes maturation, and ultimately produces a substantive crop. As the production of fruit is a process that occurs over a period of time, the implied reader construes discipleship as a mode of maturation and growth.⁵³

Intrusion by the narrator following the fourth instance of sowing (8.8b) heightens the importance of Jesus' final instruction – ὁ ἔχων ὥτα ἀκούειν ἀκούτω – which forms a rhetorical bridge to the second Galilean ministry speech (particularly its conclusion – 6.46-49) via the verb ἀκούω. The implied author leaves the identity of the disciples who approach Jesus following the parable open ended (8.9-10). This ambiguity around the precise identification of “disciples” coincides with the Lukan narrative elsewhere and serves as a rhetorical mechanism for the implied author; the implied reader must ascertain which characters and character groups qualify as disciples, with the fourth speech serving as the interpretive key. The intertextual citation by Jesus in the statement of case (Isa 6.9-10 in 8.10) – which forms part of his response to the inquiring disciples – elicits a intratextual connection back to the Lukan prologue (1.4) in the form of συνίζω. The rhetorical deduction for the implied reader is that Jesus' message (and the “kingdom of God”) is only understandable to those who “interpret” (συνίζω) it;⁵⁴ however, for those who fail to enact the interpretive process, it remains a “mystery” (μυστήρια).

⁵³This coincides with conversion in Greco-Roman antiquity (e.g., Thomas M. Finn, *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity* [New York: Paulist Press, 1997] *passim*). As argued by Charles H. Talbert (“Conversion in the Acts of the Apostles: Ancient Auditors' Perceptions,” in *Literary Studies*, 141-53), conversion in Luke-Acts is both moral and cognitive.

⁵⁴Moessner (“Appeal and Power,” 108) contends that Apollos' accurate (καθεξῆς) interpretation of the Christian message (Acts 18.24-19.7) “prefigures a Theophilus, Luke's readers, who must follow the two-volume narrative καθεξῆς to gain the firmer grasp of the Way of the Lord.”

Like the introduction (8.5-8), the body of the speech (8.11-15) does not focus on the types of soil but the outcomes of sowing. This is evident in several ways. First, deviation in the parallel construction of the four periods in the fourth example serves to accentuate its rhetorical impact to the implied reader – namely, the demonstrative pronoun (οὗτος), which is used in the first three examples (8.11-14), falls from use in the final example (8.15). Next, rhetorical repetition of ἀκούω with all four examples underscores the *topos* of the statement of case – an appropriate understanding of the kingdom of God (viz., Jesus’ message) must go beyond hearing to interpretation. Third, deductive activity on the part of the implied reader is culled by the implied author through intratextual connections between the first and second examples (8.5-6, 12-13) and the episode of Jesus’ temptation with the devil in 4.1-13. The implied reader concludes that the devil tempts Jesus’ disciples just as he tempted Jesus, yet the disciples lack Jesus’ faith and ultimately fail to spurn the seduction of the devil. Lastly, sequential maturation of faith is evident in the teleological progression of each example – which is further underscored by a redactional comparison of Luke and Mark – with the final instance reaching full maturation.

Both deductive and inductive argument is employed by the implied author in the conclusion (8.16-18). Repetition of elements of the statement of case (8.9-10) in the conclusion prompts the implied reader and the narrative audience to connect “the secrets of the kingdom of God” with the “fruit” produced in the good soil. The intratextual intertwining of the statement of case and the conclusion also places hearing and understanding in the foreground for the implied reader. The first two metaphors Jesus cites in the conclusion are enthymemes, both of which are linked through their use of φανερός. By means of the rhetorical argument – that is, the absurdity of

concealing a lamp within a house is the corollary of hearing Jesus' message and not enacting it to full maturation – the implied reader subsequently concludes that disciples are compelled to embody a disposition and actions representative of Jesus' message. The final metaphor further heightens the importance of doing hearing in conjunction with interpretation; the latter helps assure that genuine hearing results.

6.2 Narrative Trajectories Engender Characterization

Investigation of the Markan narrative through the lens of narrative, rhetorical, and reader-response criticisms shows how the Parable of the Sower (Mark 4.1-20) is an essential ingredient in the construction of characterization. Character types roughly correspond with the four different taxonomies of soil.⁵⁵ The speech remains pivotal to Lukan characterization, though with some permutation. Specifically, redactional activity by the Lukan implied author changes the rhetorical focus to the resulting activities ("fruit") of the four taxonomies versus a concentration on the actual "seed" in the Markan narrative. Disinterest (and even misrepresentation) in the sowing process in Luke is possible corroboration of this redactional element. Subsequent episodes in the narrative provide further fodder for the implied author's emphasis on outcome ("fruit"). One such instance is the Parable of the Barren Fig Tree (Lk 13.6-9), where the production of "fruit" is established as the discerning measurement. Demarcation of characters and character groups that conform with the first three sowing examples and the final sowing example divide along the lines of correct (or incorrect) "interpretation" of Jesus' message – those who fall into the first three taxonomies fail

⁵⁵Tolbert, *Sowing*, 148-63; eadem, "Builds Character," 347-57.

to “see” and “understand,” while those who coincide with the final taxonomy “see” and “understand” (8.9-10).

The speech initiates analeptic as well as proleptic activity; the implied reader examines characters and character groups from prior narrative and then subsequent narrative via the newly introduced taxonomies. This activity becomes retrospective for the implied reader as the narrative moves forward: characters and character groups from earlier in the narrative are reevaluated based on new characters and character groups. In addition, evaluation of characters and character groups accounts for stereotypical traits – both intratextual and extratextual – represented by their larger social, religious, political, and gender locations.⁵⁶

6.2.1 *First Sowing Example: Sowing Along the Path*

The first taxonomic example depicts a situation in which the seed does not even sprout. Imagery in the introduction and the body attributes the failure to the devil. The Lukan narrative is replete with examples where this is the case. Individuals and groups include Herod the tetrarch (Lk 3.19-20; 9.7-9); those who fail to show benefaction to Jesus’ disciples (Lk 10.10-15); the priest and Levite from the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10.25-37); Sadducees and temple leaders (Lk 20.20-47; 22.47-23.25; Acts 4.1-22; 5.17-42; 6.8-8.1; 22.30-23.35; 24.1-9; 25.1-12); Jewish opposition in Acts (Acts 9.23-24; 12.1-5; 13.44-52; 14.1-7; 14.19-20; 17.1-9, 10-15; 18.12-17; 20.3; 21.27-36; 24.9; 25.27; 25.1-12); the Jewish false prophet Bar-Jesus (Elymas, the magician; Acts 13.4-12); the owners of the possessed slave girl (Acts 16.16-24); the

⁵⁶See Stephen Halliwell, “Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character,” in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 32-59; Christopher Gill, “The Question of Character and Personality in Greek Tragedy,” *Poetics Today* 7 (1986) 251-73.

seven sons of Sceva (Acts 19.11-20); Demetrius, the silversmith, and fellow Ephesian crafts workers (Acts 19.23-41); and the high priest Ananias (24.1-8). There are some overarching attributes of this character taxonomy that the implied reader constructs from the narrative discourse. Foremost is that many of the individual characters or character groups exhibit animosity towards Jesus or his followers. This ranges from rhetorical challenges to actual infliction of physical harm – even death. At the same time, there is a *topos* connected to the characterization of these individuals that adumbrates a journey ending in spiritual – and even physical – condemnation. Specifically, while those who actively oppose Jesus and his followers initially escape spiritual and physical punishment, they ultimately face apocalyptic judgment. The characterization of Herod is one such example. His social and political standing remains unaffected, if not grows in stature, despite his imprisonment and murder of John the Baptist (Lk 3.19-20; 9.7-9), implication in Jesus’ trial (Lk 23.6-12), and murder of James and arrest of Peter (Acts 12.1-5). Indeed, immediately before he is smitten by God he seemingly ascends to the apex of social and political success (Acts 12.20-23).

6.2.2 *Second Sowing Example: Sowing on the Rock*

Growth progresses further with the second taxonomic example: the seed germinates but withers away due to the lack of moisture. The devil, though not mentioned by name, remains in purview for the implied reader through the use of intratextual irony: the use of *πειρασμῶ* in the introduction and body (8.6, 13) mirrors its earlier use in the temptation episode between Jesus and the devil (4.2, 12-13). However, Jesus, unlike the characters and character groups representative of this

taxonomy, does not succumb to the devil's "temptation" (πειρασμῶ). Though initially embodied by enthusiastic reception (viz., received with "joy"), the ultimate failure of the seed to produce "fruit" revolves around two related issues: "lack of moisture" (8.6) and failure to "take root" (8.13). Analeptic analysis by the implied reader pinpoints one character group as exhibiting the character traits of the second example: Jesus' hometown synagogue crowd, who initially give him a positive reception but then violently reject him because of the threat his message poses to their positions of honor (Lk 4.28-30). Except for the tragic betrayal of Jesus by the disciples – particularly Judas and Peter (Lk 22.31-34, 47-53, 54-62) – additional characters and character groups whom the implied reader associates with the second taxonomic example do not appear in the narrative until Acts. Simon the Magician (8.4-24) is the first character in Acts who exhibits the traits of the second sowing example. His succumbing to temptation revolves around his desire for spiritual honor and fallacious thinking that spiritual honor can be purchased. The mercurial actions of the Lycaonian crowd (ὄχλος) also resembles the second sowing taxonomy (Acts 14.8-20): ranging from their initial reaction in which they identify Paul and Barnabas as Greek gods, to an emphatic attempt to offer sacrifice to them (even after Paul's reponse to their initial reaction), to utter rejection and attempt to kill (which they thought was successful; cf. v. 19d) both Paul and Barnabas (upon being persuaded by Jews from Antioch and Iconium).

6.2.3 *Third Sowing Example: Sowing Among the Thorns*

Progression towards the bearing of fruit continues with the third taxonomic example, where fruit is produced but does not ripen. The impetus for the failure of

those embodying the traits of this sowing activity involves desire for honor in the form of wealth and, in particular, the ability to achieve honor through its possession (8.14). Through associative accumulation the implied reader determines that characters and character groups who represent this sowing activity conform with the rhetorical dimension of tragedy – the rich fool (Lk 12.13-21), the rich man (in the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus – Lk 16.19-31), the rich ruler (Lk 18.18-30), Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5.1-11), the disciples of Antioch (Acts 11.27-30), and the owners of the slave girl (Acts 16.16-24). The antithesis of this sowing type is exemplified in a number of instances in the narrative via characters or character groups who abandon positions of honor in exchange for embracing the word of God. Analeptic examples include Levi (5.27-32), the centurion with an ill servant (7.1-10), and the women followers of Jesus (8.1-3). Proleptic association places others such as the Good Samaritan (Lk 10.25-36), Martha (Lk 10.38-42), Zacchaeus (Lk 19.1-10), the widow in the temple (Lk 21.1-4), the early Christian community in Jerusalem (Acts 2.43-47; 4.32-37; 6.1-6), Barnabas (Acts 4.32-37), Tabitha (Acts 9.36-43), the disciples of Antioch (Acts 11.27-30), Lydia (Acts 16.11-15), the Philippian jailor (Acts 16.25-40), and Publius and the inhabitants of Malta (Acts 28.7-10) into the third sowing activity as well. A *topos* that comes to the forefront in the comparison of these antithetical types is that characters whom the implied reader classifies as representing the third sowing taxonomy use possessions as a means of securing honor for themselves (or their social, political, religious groups), whereas those opposite the character taxonomy use possessions to confer honor upon those lacking honor as a result of the paucity of possessions.

6.2.4 *Fourth Sowing Example: Sowing into the Good Soil*

The final sowing taxonomy focuses the implied reader on the production of “fruit,” a process that occurs over a period of time with an exerted effort in order for the maturation to reach completion. Two redactional elements make this even more evident to a real reader. The first is the redactional deletion of the Markan three-fold yield (4.8) to the highest yield (“hundredfold”) in Luke (8.15). The second is the redactional addition of the adjectival preposition ἐν ὑπομονῇ and the modification of παραδέχομαι to κατέχω (Lk 8.15; cf. Mark 4.8), both of which serve to underline the need for enduring faith. While the implied reader is not cognizant of the redactional activity of the implied author, the implied reader does ascertain the rhetorical results – an emphasis on persevering discipleship.

Characters and character groups whom the implied reader associates with the fourth sowing taxonomy encompass a broad canvas of the Lukan narrative discourse. The foremost characters in the first volume are those of God and Jesus; the former exhibiting everlasting, compassionate love for humankind throughout history and the latter showing unwavering endurance unto death. This mode of characterization continues in the sequel. In addition, characterization of the Holy Spirit as the conduit for the divine to humankind also bridges both volumes.⁵⁷

Luke is replete with character examples of the fourth sowing taxonomy. Analeptic referents include the Jewish actors in the birth narratives (Zechariah, Elizabeth, Mary, Simeon, Anna in Lk 1.5-2.38); John the Baptist (Lk 3.1-20; 7.18-35); the twelve disciples, as represented by Simon Peter, John, and James (Lk 5.1-11; 22.31-34,47-62); the friends of the paralytic (Lk 5.17-26); and the sinful woman who

⁵⁷Cf. Shepherd, *Holy Spirit*; Hur, *Dynamic Reading*.

approaches Jesus at the house of Simon the Pharisee (Lk 7.36-50). Proleptic referents include the menstruating woman (Lk 8.42c-48), the Good Samaritan (Lk 10.25-37); the dishonest steward (Lk 16.1-12); the widow in the Parable of the Widow and Judge (Lk 18.1-8); the blind beggar from Jericho (Lk 18.35-43); Zachaeus (Lk 19.1-10); and the faithful servants in the Parable of the Ten Pounds (Lk 19.11-27). Leading protagonists in the narrative discourse of Acts include the twelve disciples, as represented by Simon Peter, John, and James, and other leaders such as Stephen, Barnabas, Philip, and Paul and his companions. Lesser characters in the narrative of Acts also coincide with the final sowing taxonomy, which include the early Christian community in Jerusalem (2.41-47; 4.32-37); the Ethiopian eunuch (8.26-40); Ananias (9.10-19); Tabitha (9.36-43); Cornelius (10.1-48); Rhoda (12.12-17); Lydia (16.11-15); the Philippian jailor (16.25-40); Gentiles who respond positively to the message delivered by Paul and his companions; the Beroean Jews (17.10-15); Dionysius the Areopagite and Damaris at Athens (17.16-34); Apollos (18.24-28; 19.1-7); Aquila and Priscilla (18.1-4, 24-28); the Ephesian church (19.1-41; 20.17-38); and Julius the centurion (27.1-3, 30-44).

Several character groups exemplifying the fourth sowing activity receive enhanced attention in the narrative discourse; the result being that the implied reader – through the rhetorical activity of *synkrisis* – associates the disposition and actions of these characters with other characters of the same character type. One instance is the faith of the twelve disciples, as largely exemplified through Simon Peter, John, and James, ranging from their initial calling (Lk 5.1-11), to pronouncements of faith (Lk 9.28-36), to disavowment (Lk 22.31-34, 47-62), to reconciliation (Lk 24.12-53), to reconstitution (Acts 1.3-26), to continued discipleship (Acts 2.1-6.6; 9.32-12.17; 15.1-

29). The implied reader understands discipleship within this more detailed contextual framework as a journey and not something that occurs at one point in time.

Journeying forms an important *topos* in both Luke and Acts and assumes allegorical meaning for the implied reader, representing both the physical journey (in the case of Jesus in Lk 9.51-19.44 and in the case of Paul and his companions in Acts 13.1-14.28, 16.1-21.16, and 23.12-28.16) as well as the spiritual journey of discipleship.⁵⁸ Of course, it is not coincidental that the Christian movement is designated as “the Way” (ὁδός) in Acts (9.2; 19.9, 23; 22.4; 24.14, 22). The narrative discourse utilizes several character examples to demonstrate the importance of consistent discipleship. One such instance is the failure of John, the one called Mark, to complete the initial Gentile missionary journey. The implied reader construes his actions as exemplifying traits of the third sowing type (Acts 13.5c; 15.36-41).⁵⁹ Subsequent characterization of Eutychus, who falls asleep and drops from the third story window, symbolically, through antithesis, represents the importance of persistent discipleship and the dangers of failing to sustain enduring discipleship (Acts 20.7-12).⁶⁰

Another case where this mode of characterization receives elaboration as the narrative progresses is that of the women disciples (Lk 8.1-3; 10.38-42; 23.27, 49, 55; 24.1-11). The narrative transition in Lk 8.1-3 places women as benefactors who

⁵⁸See Arthur A. Just Jr., *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1993) 58; Green, *Theology of the Gospel*, 102-09.

⁵⁹For a discussion of John Mark’s characterization, see C. Clifton Black, “John Mark in the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Literary Studies*, 101-20.

⁶⁰The implied reader likely identifies an intratextual link to Jesus’ admonition to the sleeping disciples in Lk 23.46: Eutychus, like the disciples before Jesus’ arrest, engenders danger by falling asleep (which allegorically alludes to a failure to demonstrate enduring discipleship).

symbolically help make the “journey” *topos* possible. The women disciples reappear at the end of the narrative in Luke, where they stand in contradistinction with the crowds and multitudes, who initially embrace Jesus and his message but ultimately reject him in favor of Barabbas (Lk 23.18-25),⁶¹ and the disciples, who reject Jesus upon his arrest. Indeed, the narrator reveals to the implied reader that the women benefactors of 8.1-3 followed Jesus all of the way to the crucifixion (from Galilee; 23.49), a notation that certainly stands out to the implied reader as a model of true discipleship. Following Jesus’ death and burial, the characterization of the women disciples is juxtaposed against the male disciples: the women demonstrate “interpretation” representative of “true” disciples (8.10) by understanding the meaning of the “empty tomb” (cf. 24.8), whereas the men do not believe and dismiss the report based on androcentric systems opposed to women as reliable witnesses (cf. 24.11). The positive portrayal of women followers continues in Acts via disciples such as Tabitha (9.36-43), Rhoda (12.12-16), Lydia (16.11-15), the Athenian Damaris (17.34), and Priscilla (18.24-28).

6.3 Narrative Trajectories Engender *Topoi*

The growing size of the crowds seeking to hear Jesus teach and to receive healing from him – the largest to gather before Jesus at this point of in the narrative – forms the rhetorical situation for the speech. The rhetorical argument of the speech provides the implied reader with an interpretive framework for discerning characteristics of “true” disciples and those who fail to embody those characteristics.

⁶¹Through extratextual repertoire the actions of the crowds and multitudes likely take on a secondary, allegorical meaning for the implied reader, pointing towards the eventual demise of Jerusalem and those who rebelled against the authority of Rome (cf. Lk 21.10-36).

This dampens the perceived momentum of Jesus' ministry for the implied reader, who, through analeptic application of the interpretative framework recognizes that many of the characters encountered thus far in the narrative coincide with one of the first three character types rather than the fourth sowing category. The fourth speech is rich in *topoi* that either directly derive from the characteristics of the character types portrayed or are constructed indirectly by the implied reader by means of comparison and contrast. As many of these were discussed in detail in the above discussion, only a short overview is needed.

6.3.1 Maturation, Production of Fruit, Importance of "Doing"

Perhaps the foremost *topos* is the emphasis on the actual production of fruit. Correct "interpretation" is not simply an intellectual exercise but a lasting journey that results in a bountiful harvest. Characters whom the implied reader associates with the fourth sowing activity serve to help adumbrate this *topos*. The characteristics of this stereotype include willingness to use positions of honor to bestow honor upon others. In particular, there is significant thematic emphasis on the use of material possessions to discharge honor. This *topos* appears as early as John the Baptist's preaching in Lk 3.1-14, where he exhorts the multitudes to use their possessions to bestow honor on those who are lacking possessions (and thus honor). It continues as an abiding theme of Jesus' preaching and ministry in Luke and then that of the early church in Acts. Those who fail to use their positions of honor (or possessions) to empower others are not considered as "true" disciples according to the interpretative framework set forth in the fourth speech but rather coincide with the sowing activities of the third example.

6.3.2 *Condemnation of and Triumph Over Divination and Magic*

An underlying *topos* connected to the use of honor enters the narrative once the story turns towards the Gentile mission in Acts: divination and magic are embraced as modes of social and spiritual elevation, frequently at the loss of honor – related to gender, spiritual, and social standing. Interestingly, characters who fit this construct are not only Gentiles but Jews as well. Disciples triumph when facing characters who enact divination and magic in this manner and often administer punishment upon these same individuals. Some of the most notable examples include Bar-Jesus, the Jewish false prophet and magician serving Proconsul Sergius Paulus (13.4-12); the owners of the divining slave girl at Philippi (Acts 16.16-24); and the sons of Sceva (Acts 19.11-20).⁶²

6.3.3 *Repudiation and Persecution Results in Apocalyptic Condemnation*

Eventual apocalyptic demise for those who repudiate and persecute “true” disciples forms a *topos* that extends from Luke to Acts. Characters and character groups – despite possessing social, religious, and political power – who coincide with this stereotype exhibit the most egregious failures around the misuse of honor in the narrative. Examples include Herod the tetrarch (Acts 12.20-24); the temple authorities as represented by the chief priest, priests, scribes, and Sadducees (extratextual repertoire = annihilation with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE – Lk 21.5-36); and the seven sons of Sceva (Acts 19.11-20).

⁶²See Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress Press, 1989).

The narrative discourse also steers the implied reader to rhetorical irony: the persecution inflicted by these characters on “true” disciples, rather than quelling spiritual formation and growth, engenders renewed success and expansion. Examples include the attempt by Jesus’ hometown synagogue to kill him and the subsequent success he achieves in Capernaum (Lk 4.14-30; cf. 4.37); condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees and their plotting against Jesus (Lk 11.37-54; cf. 12.1); arrest of the apostles and growth of believers (Acts 4.1-31; cf. 4.32-37); the subsequent arrest of the apostles and their miraculous escape from prison (Acts 5.17-40; cf. 5.41-42 and 6.7); the stoning of Stephen and spread of Christianity to Samaria (Acts 7.54-8.3; cf. 8.4-8, 25); the murder of James, the brother of John, the imprisonment of Peter, and death of Herod (Acts 12.1-23; cf. 12.24); and the persecution of Paul and his companions during their ministry and preaching (Acts 13.48-52; 14.19-20; 19.8-10, 11-20).⁶³

6.3.4 *Discipleship and the “Heart” (Καρδία)*

The fourth sowing example culls an earlier *topos* from the second Galilean speech (8.15; cf. 6.45): the connection between καρδία (“heart”) and discipleship. In the case of the fourth speech, the *topos*, by means of the body, is used as an ascription to the character type coinciding with the fourth sowing example (i.e., “true” disciples). Intratextual linkage between the second speech, where the implied reader associates those who possess “good hearts” with fruit-producing fig trees and grape vines (versus

⁶³See O. Wesley Allen, *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 158; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), who argues that the death of Herod, a tyrant, forms a *topos* in Luke-Acts, one that derives from Greco-Roman narrative type-scenes.

association of those who possess “evil hearts” with non-fruit producing thorns and bramble bushes), and the fourth speech accentuates the *topos* of a bountiful, ongoing harvest, which, via the fourth sowing example, is associated with the actions of a “true” disciple.

7 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

My preceding analysis demonstrates how the rhetorical texture of the first four speeches of Jesus in Luke plays a key role in the construction of plot, characterization, and *topoi* – both analeptically and proleptically – in Luke-Acts. Rhetorical analysis of the four speeches also plays an integral part in understanding the narrative nuances of the speeches, and consequently how the resulting trajectories help shape and steer the narrative discourse and meaning for the implied reader.

The four speeches also form the basis for much of the overarching narrative discourse of both Luke and Acts. Coinciding with the nature of ancient Greco-Roman narrative, plot and *topoi* establish the parameters for the implied reader’s construction of characterization. In particular, the implied reader’s adumbration of plot and *topoi* is propelled by the rhetorical texture of the four speeches. Likewise, the interpretive framework for constructing characterization and evaluating characters and character groups also lies within the four speeches.

10

HERMENEUTICAL APPROPRIATION BY AUTHIORIAL READERS AND IDEOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION

Interest in readers over the past decade by an increasing number of scholars in the field of biblical studies marks an important transition, a movement from a formalistic hermeneutic to a much more dynamic, integrated hermeneutic. The former focuses on textual configurations, whereas the latter is interested in ideological systems – both those that shape author and discourse and those that affect the location of real readers today. Of course, there are potential deficiencies with this directional change, with the risk being that “the baby is thrown out with the bath water” vis-à-vis utilization of various forms of post-structural and ideological criticisms that examine texts with little or no concern for intra-, inter-, and extra-textual parameters.¹ On the contrary, as I argued in detail in chapter two, an ethical hermeneutic constrains real readers to understand the interpretive obligations that exist between implied authors and implied readers.² It also compels real readers to ascertain how the narrative

¹See, e.g., Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1998); idem, “Reader,” 301-28.

²Booth, *Company We Keep*, esp. 169-200.

discourse both coincides with and runs counter to ideological systems.³ Accordingly, by not only looking at narrative texture concerning areas such as plot, characterization, theme, and *topoi* but seeking to understand how these define a discourse that concurrently corresponds, as well as differs from existing ideological constructs of the implied reader, my hermeneutical exercise moves beyond simply *reading with* to *critical reading* or even *reading against* – the three modes of reading as conduction (as discussed in chapter two).⁴

A significant gap in the investigation of biblical texts also exists in the attention given to initial flesh-and- blood readers, not only in regard to their ideological locations but even more to how their ideological locations affect appropriation of narrative discourse. My approach herein moves beyond understanding the implied reader as a one-dimensional textual construct to a multidimensional, living entity comprised of different cultural systems – religious, gender, political, ethnic, and social. Meaning-making dimensions of the same text therefore expand as it is examined from the lens of different readerly ideological locations.

1 GETTING FROM IMPLIED READER TO AUTHORIAL READERS

The contractual agreement between implied authors and implied readers sets the stage for the analysis of authorial readers, with ideological systems delimiting multivalent modes of appropriation. The construct “implied reader” derives from

³Wuthnow (*Communities of Discourse*, 1-21) describes this as the “problem of articulation” – how narrative discourse can both be shaped by its cultural location while concurrently managing to disengage from and even challenge that very cultural context in which it was generated. Also, Freedman and Miller, *Re-Thinking Theory*, 229-33.

⁴See Booth, *Company We Keep*, esp. 70-77; idem, “Ethics of Forms,” 102-05, for reading as conduction and the three-fold delineation.

reader-response criticism and, as a structure of the text, embodies the various predispositions necessary for a literary work to exercise its effect.⁵ While extremely valuable in circumscribing rhetorical texture and resulting narrative discourse, the implied reader constrains the hermeneutical enterprise, tethering it to the formalistic parameters of author and text. As such, while the implied reader plays an important role in adumbrating narrative texture and helps lay the foundation for hermeneutical investigation, a different construct is needed in order to move the discussion to one that aims to understand plausible modes of ideological transformation that result from the rhetorical effects of narrative discourse.⁶

A reading construct that has gained widespread acceptance over the past decade is that of “authorial audience” – the hypothetical audience for which authors rhetorically design their narratives.⁷ The construct “authorial audience” is multidimensional in that narrative – and certainly ancient Greco-Roman narrative – is written for flesh-and-blood readers, whereby members of the actual audience appropriate narrative discourse in slightly different ways based on variables in their ideological systems. This does not mean that the authorial audience consists of an infinite mixture of ideological systems, however. This is more true of ancient Greco-Roman narrative than modern and post-modern narrative in which the authorial audience consists of an almost infinite number of ideological reading locations. Rather, in the case of ancient Greco-Roman narrative, the constructs of author and text

⁵See, e.g., Iser, *Implied Reader*, *passim*.

⁶For the limitations of “implied reader” as a textual construct, see Peter J. Rabinowitz, “Where We Are When We Read,” in *Authorizing Readers*, 1-28, esp. 4-9.

⁷First proposed by Rabinowitz (“Truth in Fiction,” 121-41; *idem*, *Before Reading*, esp. 15-42).

constrain meaning by demarcating an interpretive community much smaller than those assumed by author and text in modern and post-modern narrative. For example, for Luke-Acts, an authorial reader from the upper reaches of society seems implausible based on the parameters delimited by both the intratextual and extratextual repertoire. Likewise, leaders of rabbinical Judaism – the outgrowth of Pharisaical Judaism – would fall outside of the boundaries of the authorial audience.⁸

I demonstrated in the preceding chapters how the rhetorical texture of Jesus' four Galilean speeches plays an important role in shaping the narrative discourse through various trajectories – plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi*. The next logical step in this hermeneutical endeavor is to consider potential ways in which authorial readers may have appropriated the narrative discourse; ways in which the narrative discourse intersects with their ideological systems, ranging from confirmation, to reinterpretation, to even confrontation. I believe that by exposing this aspect within the parameters of the hermeneutical process, interpreters of biblical texts – and, in the case of my critical inquiry, Luke-Acts – can better understand the rhetorical implications of the narrative discourse, which, in turn, will provide a more well-informed framework for appropriation by readers today.

2 APPROPRIATION BY AUTHORIAL READERS

Appropriation of narrative discourse takes place when readers connect the world of the text back to their lives. As such, the fictive world of the text is

⁸Simply because potential (hypothetical) readers – comprising different social, ethnic, religious, and political elements – are outside of the parameters of the authorial audience does *not* invalidate a reading from their vantage point. As many of these reading positions would oppose the rhetorical strategy of the narrative discourse, a mode of reading from one of those vantage points would coincide with what Booth terms “*reading against*” (“Ethics of Forms,” 102-05).

metaphorically transposed into the realm of the imaginary.⁹ It is within this context that transformation occurs. Authors use ideological conventions – which are shared with the authorial audience – as interpretive protocols. Yet, at the same time, authors use ideological conventions to provoke transformation on the part of readers, with the ideological conventions providing the means to reenforce or modify cultural protocols and beliefs and, in turn, spur readers to action.

Rhetorical texture – as denoted by the categories of Greco-Roman rhetorical argument: invention, arrangement, and style (and then memory and delivery for the orator) – serves as the driving impetus behind this hermeneutical framework. A shared convention between author and reader, rhetorical argument consists of ideological systems that not only help guide the authorial audience in making sense of the text but serve as a means for hermeneutical transformation in that the ideological systems of the authorial audience are confirmed, reinterpreted, or even challenged. I demonstrated in chapter nine how this is true of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts – specifically in terms of how the implied author, through the rhetorical argument of four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry, uses ideological systems as both an interpretive protocol as well as a hermeneutical “lever” that compels the authorial audience to construe a fictive world containing systems different than those they embrace, with the rhetorical effect being a permutation in beliefs and actions. Rhetorical and narrative texture serves as a means of power, whereby the implied author compels the authorial audience to embrace systems and beliefs represented in the narrative discourse – those

⁹Iser, *Fictive and the Imaginary*. Also, Robert Scholes, *Protocols of Reading* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989) 89-155; Herman C. Wactjen, “Social Location and the Hermeneutical Mode of Integration,” in *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, vol. 1, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Minneapolis,: Fortress Press, 1995) 75-94.

that conform with as well as those that run counter to the ideological positions of the authorial audience. The narrative discourse also uses rhetorical power to position rejection of the narrative discourse as tantamount to repudiation of the *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* of the narrative discourse.¹⁰ The implied author also employs deductive and inductive argument based on divine action; the rhetorical argument places authorial readers in a position of spurning the divine if they fail to accept the ideological constructs of the narrative discourse.

3 IDENTIFYING DIFFERENT AUTHORIAL READERS

In chapter two, I discussed the fallacies associated with attempts over the past decade and a half to identify the precise contours of the communities addressed by the implied authors of the four Gospels. These attempts are founded on a flawed methodology in that it is not possible to postulate a complete correlation between a text and the social group that carries and receives it.¹¹ That said, there are discernible facets regarding the authorial audience, culled from intratextual and extratextual repertoire, such as knowledge of the LXX and extra-biblical Greco-Roman narrative, cultural codes, and so forth (see chapter two for more in-depth overview). Authorial readers fall within the social network of Theophilus and cover a broad range of personages – from men and women, to masters and slaves, to patrons and clients, to

¹⁰For a discussion of rhetorical power, see Steven Mailloux, *Rhetorical Power* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989) 3-18; Seymour Chatman, *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990) 90-108, 184-204.

¹¹This is more so with narrative than with epistolary texts, as the latter contain many more rhetorical markers that assist in uncovering the rhetorical situation (cf. Dennis L. Stamps, “Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualization of the Situation in New Testament Epistles,” in *1992 Heidelberg Conference*, 193-210).

Gentile and Jew, to political officials and mere residents, to Roman citizens and non-Roman citizens, to varying degrees of wealth and poverty. In addition, there seems to be sufficient intratextual and extratextual evidence for an audience located in a Hellenistic urban setting and one that likely did not include the upper and lower extremities of society.¹² Reflecting the composition of most Hellenistic urban environments, the authorial audience likely consisted of an ethnic mixture – Jews, Godfearers, and Gentiles. Situated somewhere at the end of the first century CE, and certainly post-70 CE, separation of Jewish Christians from the synagogue, both voluntarily and forcibly, had taken place or was in the process of occurring.¹³ The apologetic aim of the narrative, with a primary trajectory aimed at demonstrating the validity of the Christian movement within the Jewish heritage and a lesser offshoot at positioning Christianity within political and social boundaries of honor,¹⁴ implies an authorial audience concerned about the legitimacy of Christianity in regard to its

¹²Attempts to identify a specific Hellenistic city are fruitless (*contra* Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 25-26). Indeed, the very nature of travel and communication networks between communities – with a specific focus on Christian communities – in Greco-Roman antiquity leaves open the possibility that the authorial audience could have spanned more than one urban setting (see, e.g., Alexander, “Ancient Book Production,” 71-105; Michael B. Thompson, “The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation,” in *Gospel for All*, 49-70).

¹³The debate on the significance of the *Birkat ha-minim* for Jewish Christians and the extent to which it contributed to separation of Jewish Christians from the synagogue is vast and cannot be resolved in this study. In addition, questions around the evangelistic interest of first-century CE Judaism are extensive, with significant proponents on both sides of the issue. What can be said is that the narrative of Luke-Acts depicts the Jewish opponents of Christianity in a mode of missionary rivalry (cf. Acts 13.48-52; 14.1-7, 19-20; 17.5-9).

¹⁴See, e.g., Alexander, “Acts of the Apostles,” 15-44; Gregory E. Sterling, “‘Athletes of Virtue’: An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16),” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994) 679-96; idem, *Historiography*, 357-87.

Jewish lineage and standing within Hellenistic culture at large.¹⁵ Further, the authorial audience, if not Christian, is irrefutably predisposed to the Christian movement. Interpretive protocols include an extratextual repertoire that consists of knowledge that the gospel had been preached to Gentiles and to Jews and of the intra-communal Jewish debate (in which they may be participants) regarding the inclusion of Gentiles and formation of a heterogeneous community.¹⁶ The focus of the narrative is not on *what* happened but *how* it happened.

Personages in Greco-Roman antiquity reflect social, gender, ethnic, political, and religious roles that affect hermeneutical appropriation. This translates into an authorial audience that is multidimensional, an entity consisting of readers with differing ideological beliefs and cultural backgrounds. As such, the hermeneutical encounter between the ideological systems of authorial readers and the ideological systems represented by the narrative discourse engenders different modes of appropriation. Authorial readers endowed with power because of material possessions versus authorial readers lacking power because of the paucity of material possessions each accentuate different meaning-making dimensions of the same text; the narrative discourse prompts discomfort for the former, whereas it delivers a sense of comfort for the latter.¹⁷ The ideological readerly locations I will consider as part of the

¹⁵However cf. Paul W. Walaskay, *"And So We Came to Rome": The Political Perspective of St. Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) *passim*, who argues that the narrative of Luke-Acts is a pro-Roman apologia targeted at an anti-Roman audience. The deficiencies of his investigation are numerous and have been pinpointed by many.

¹⁶The authorial audience is in a superior position to the implied reader in that authorial readers possess prior knowledge (e.g., what happened to Paul versus the open ending of Acts [28.30-31]) not known to the implied reader.

¹⁷However cf. Scholes (*Protocols of Reading*, 104-109) who points out that *identity* and *experience* are not equivalents.

hermeneutical process of appropriation includes the following taxonomies: (1) Gentile, Jew, and Godfearer; (2) men and women; (3) honorable and shameful; (4) wealthy and poor; and (5) disciples of Jesus and disciples of John the Baptist. It is important to note that these taxonomies are not finite boundaries for all of the plausible locations from which appropriation of the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts can take place. Rather, the taxonomies draw from ideological systems of Greco-Roman antiquity, thereby reflecting the likely composition of predominant authorial readers of Luke-Acts.

4 AUTHORIAL READERS AND IDEOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION

Hermeneutical appropriation of the narrative discourse takes place on a number of different ideological levels. My ensuing analysis will account for a total of five modes of ideological transformation: (1) deconstruction of honor and shame protocols; (2) reshaping of benefaction – namely, extension of salvation to the ends of the earth; (3) expansion of religious and ethnic boundaries; (4) elevation of Jesus and his followers over John the Baptist and his followers; and (5) hermeneutical appropriation and gender dimensions.

4.1 Reinterpretation of Honor and Shame Protocols

Cultural interaction in Greco-Roman antiquity was heavily dependent on the constructs of honor and shame. Both ascribed and acquired, honor and shame determined modes of exchange between individuals. Sensitive to public judgments and reproach, individuals from birth were taught to seek honor and avoid shame. Successful adherence to cultural norms determines honor; those who obviate cultural norms bring shame upon themselves and even others such as family members and

friends.¹⁸ Greco-Roman rhetoric draws upon these cultural codes, using the audience's desire for honor and aversion to shame to achieve rhetorical persuasion.¹⁹

4.1.1 Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the First Galilean Speech

The first speech of the Galilean ministry presents a construct at odds with common cultural frameworks: Jesus' failure to show benefaction to his hometown synagogue – versus the benefaction he dispenses to those outside of his boundaries of kinship – disorients the authorial audience. The LXX intertextual examples (Lk 4.25-27) reenforce the disorientation in that both depict benefaction towards individuals outside of ethnic and even religious boundaries. For an authorial reader, Jesus brings disgrace upon himself by repudiating his hometown synagogue through his speech and actions. As to authorial readers in positions of honor, the rhetorical discourse confronts modes of interaction – inside and outside his or her community. Benefaction, whether spiritual or material, is no longer determined by cultural dimensions. In addition, in accordance with the characterization of Jesus, the ultimate exemplar in Luke-Acts, authorial readers are compelled to assume positions of shame in order to extend benefaction to those outside of his or her cultural boundaries, that is, non-reciprocal benefaction is not simply shown to those within the confines of kinship and

¹⁸The breadth of research is significant; see, e.g., Halvor Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 23 (1993) 167-76; idem, "Honor and Shame," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996) 19-40; David A. deSilva, "Honor and Shame," in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2000) 518-22. For honor and shame in Luke-Acts, see Bruce J. Malina, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts," 25-66.

¹⁹David A. deSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1999); idem, "Investigating Honor Discourse: Guidelines from Classical Rhetoricians," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 491-525.

companionship. For authorial readers in positions of shame, which could derive from various deviations related to ethnicity, gender, wealth (or lack of it), or religion, the discourse extends divine benefaction (i.e., “good news”) to them while building the premise for an inclusive community, with discipleship – conformity with the fourth sowing example in the fourth speech – as the discerning factor of faithfulness.

Analeptic and proleptic narrative trajectories coalesce around the importance of inclusion; these include actions by God – represented within the narrative world of Luke-Acts as well as in the intertextual LXX examples – Jesus, and disciples. Many of the individuals and groups to whom salvation is proffered are from the cultural margin because of varying degrees of shame. Just as God and Jesus do not exclude the marginalized from salvation, authorial readers are prompted by the narrative discourse not only to include those from the cultural periphery within the circumference of fictive kinship and companionship but to avoid adverse judgments regarding the honor of a person or group based on typical modes of disposition and conduct (which would predispose individuals in positions of honor [viz., those with cultural power] to exclude individuals of shame from their social and religious networks). The narrative discourse – largely through rhetorical argument – uses symbolic systems of honor and shame to disorient and even challenge authorial readers to reevaluate actions typically deemed as honorable or shameful.²⁰ This narrative trajectory takes various forms in

²⁰Of course, this is true only to the extent that those symbolic systems coincide with the symbolic systems espoused by the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts. Individuals within the narrative world who embody antithetical symbolic systems (e.g., Herod, the Pharisees – for the most part, Ananias and Sapphira, et al.) are deemed as deviants by the implied reader. For the authorial audience individuals and groups who fail to embrace the symbolic systems of the narrative discourse are seen as deviants as well (e.g., post-70 CE Pharisaic Judaism, the wealthy who do not show non-reciprocal benefaction, those who use magic for benefaction, those who exercise positions of power [viz., honor] to dishonor others).

Luke-Acts, ranging from gender (e.g., the women who provide benefaction to Jesus in Lk 8.1-3; Mary in Lk 10.38-42), to ethnicity and religion (e.g., the centurion in Lk 7.1-10; the Hellenistic widows in Acts 6.1-6; Cornelius in Acts 10.1-11.18; the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15.1-35), to sex (e.g., the sinful woman of Lk 7.36-50; the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8.26-40), to politics (e.g., the embrace of tax collectors by Jesus and John the Baptist; Zachaeus in Lk 19.1-10), to poverty (e.g., the widow in Lk 21.1-4; the inclusion of widows in Acts 6.1-6), to uncleanness (e.g., Good Samaritan in Lk 10.25-37; Simon, the tanner, in Acts 10.1-8).

4.1.2 Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the Second Galilean Speech

The narrative discourse of the second speech in the Galilean ministry also confronts traditional constructs of honor and shame, with the introduction (6.20-26) reversing the roles of honor and shame – the powerful become weak and the weak become powerful. In this context, failure to recognize the honor of an individual or group is not an affront to social position and power. Indeed, rather than riposte or retaliation, the rhetorical argument of the second speech puts forth benefaction as the appropriate response; the result being the loss of honor by the one (and the group to which she or he belongs) who provides the act of benefaction. Extension of benefaction to individuals and groups outside of the group to which the individual belongs erases cultural boundaries by redefining ideological systems using the roles of honor and shame, both inside and outside the Christian community.

Benefaction is no longer enshrouded in the intricacies of honor and shame and, as a result, an act with the intent of acquiring honor. The narrative discourse,

therefore, defines ethical behavior as a mode of interaction without respect for boundaries demarcated by material possessions, ethnicity, religious orientation, or gender. As such, interaction is no longer controlled by kinship and friendship and the corresponding requirements of reciprocal benefaction. Benefaction extends beyond the traditional boundaries of kinship and friendship, encompassing individuals and groups who fall outside of those parameters. As a form of rhetorical power, the narrative discourse positions the actions of God as commensurate with this new mode of benefaction (Lk 6.36); the result is that those who maintain interaction based honor and shame structures do so in contradistinction with the divine.

Authorial readers in positions of power are confronted by the narrative discourse to embrace benefaction that is not enacted on the basis of the desire to secure reciprocation (6.27-36). Further, affronts to honor, and thus shameful behavior, do not necessitate riposte or retaliation in order to regain lost honor but rather the utter lack of concern for and even abdication of honor in favor of benefaction directed at the well-being and needs of the offending party (cf. the episode involving the sinful woman at the house of Simon the Pharisee in Lk 7.36-50). This ideological framework dissolves cultural boundaries; association with and interaction between different individuals and groups is no longer dictated by modes of friendship, purity, kinship, and so forth. Hence, requests by authorial readers for benefaction are not a recognition of shame but a legitimate frame of interaction within the new egalitarian community.²¹

²¹Lk 11.1-13; 17.11-19; 18.1-8; 18.35-43; 19.1-10; Acts 6.1-6; 9.36-43.

4.1.3 *Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the Third Galilean Speech*

The third speech continues the *topos* of reversing honor and shame. The rhetorical argument positions the Pharisees and lawyers as upholders of the status quo (7.29-30). Analeptic and proleptic intratextual detail corroborates this understanding. In particular, Jesus and his followers, and to a lesser extent John the Baptist and his followers, embody a symbolic system that reinterprets the one embraced by the Pharisees and lawyers; their actions and message reorient honor and shame constructs, despite pleas and challenges from those possessing cultural honor (cf. speech's body in 7.31-34). Insiders become outsiders, while outsiders become insiders.²² Specifically, the narrative is replete with irony; the chiasm links the conclusion (7.35) with the narrative aside (7.29-30), engendering the culminating conclusion by the implied reader that the divine is justified not by those possessing honor but those who are recognized as shameful (viz., the people and tax collectors who are mentioned in v.29).²³

The rhetorical argument of the third Galilean speech challenges authorial readers in positions of honor to emulate the words and actions of Jesus and John the Baptist; constructs of honor and shame are not determining factors in their social and religious interactions. Pressure to maintain honor by adhering to cultural norms in

²²See York, *Rhetoric of Reversal*.

²³The precise identity of πάντων τῶν τέκνων is disputed, ranging from Jesus and John (e.g., Hartin, "Justified by Her Children," 154-55), to those who adhere to the teachings of John and Jesus (e.g., Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 287-88), to the Pharisees and scribes (Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 302-05). When viewed through the lens of rhetorical analysis and readerly concerns, the most plausible identification is with "all the people and tax collectors" in vv.29-30 (via the chiasm between vv.29-30 and v.35 that is demarcated vis-à-vis the repetition of δικαιοῶ).

interaction with other individuals and groups is positioned by the rhetorical argument as invalid. The narrative discourse continues a *topos* of “good news” for authorial readers in positions of shame in that their actions and words justify the divine and, in turn, Jesus and John the Baptist. Their shame – whether deriving from ethnic, sexual, health, gender, or political arenas²⁴ – does not prevent them from sharing in divine benefaction and friendship alongside those in positions of honor within the Christian community. Justification requires action, however, as accentuated by the narrative discourse of the second Galilean ministry speech, which is further emphasized in the fourth speech (as well as numerous other places in the narrative of Luke-Acts).²⁵

4.1.4 Honor and Shame and the Narrative Discourse of the Fourth Galilean Speech

The fourth speech does not directly address the *topos* of honor and shame. What it does affect is the need for action. Within the context of the three prior speeches, this means that authorial readers demonstrate discipleship through enduring enactment of Jesus’ message and ministry, which includes the need to embrace an egalitarian community without concern for protecting one’s own honor – or the honor of one’s group.

²⁴See Jerome H. Neyrey, “Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and the System of Purity,” in *Social Sciences*, 80-105, for the correlation of these different locations and the construct of shame.

²⁵See the more in-depth discussion in chapters seven and nine.

4.2 Reshaping Material Benefaction

Much has been written on the *topos* of wealth and poverty in Luke-Acts.²⁶ Though some persist in arguing that the narrative discourse equates renunciation of possessions with the need for disciples to make themselves poor,²⁷ narrative evidence suggests otherwise. In particular, the rhetorical argument points towards a *topos* focused on non-reciprocal benefaction, whereby, just as the divine shows benefaction to the poor, all disciples demonstrate benefaction to the poor.²⁸ Further, as I argued in chapter four, the “poor,” by definition of the rhetorical argument in Lk 4.18-19, assumes a much broader definition in Luke-Acts, representing a composite of disadvantaged personages. Identification of this *topos* concurs with my earlier examination of the rhetorical texture of the second speech in the Galilean ministry, a *topos* that reaches back to earlier narrative. The rhetorical argument dissolves ideological constructs around honor and shame and patron and client. Interaction between individuals and groups is no longer governed by these cultural constructs; the use of honor and wealth for the benefit of power is replaced with an egalitarian focus

²⁶For a summary, see Thomas E. Phillips, “Reading Recent Readings of Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke and Acts,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 1 (2003) 231-70; idem, *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 48; Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001).

²⁷See, e.g., L. Schottroff and W. Stegemann, *Jesus von Nazareth: Hoffnung der Armen*, 3d ed. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990) esp. 101-19; Walter E. Pilgrim, *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1981) esp. 41-49.

²⁸See the three-fold argument of Roth (*Character Types*, 165-66): (1) there is no change of addressee before Lk 6.24 and the woe to the rich; (2) admonitions to share wealth later in the second speech of the Galilean ministry (6.30, 32-35) run counter to this claim (i.e., it would not make sense for disciples to share their wealth if they had become poor); and (3) consistency requires that if disciples are to be identified as the poor, they must also be identified as those hungry now and those weeping now (but disciples in Luke-Acts never go hungry [Lk 5.33; 6.1-5; 8.3; 9.3-5, 11-17; 10.3-9; 22.14-38; Acts 2.42-47; 4.32-35; 6.1-6; 11.27-30] and are often joyful [Lk 10.17; 24.52; Acts 5.41; 8.8, 39; 13.52]).

on empowering others – both inside and outside the Christian community.²⁹ The importance of this *topos* is substantiated by the rhetorical texture (vis-à-vis *synkrisis*) around characterization: characters or character groups are juxtaposed to accentuate types representing the thesis and antithesis of the *topos*: the rich man versus Lazarus (Lk 16.19-31); scribes versus the destitute widow (Lk 20.45-21.4); Barnabas versus Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 4.32-5.11); the Christian community versus Herod (Acts 11.27-12.5).

The rhetorical texture of the second speech disorients the symbolic world of authorial readers endowed with material means. The rhetorical texture stands in stark contradistinction with cultural obligations and expectations around the use of wealth, whereby those with material means would use their wealth to secure honor – whether social, political, or religious.³⁰ Those authorial readers wishing to embrace a framework of discipleship coinciding with the fourth sowing type in the final Galilean ministry speech of Jesus adopt a new model of friendship where possessions are used to provide benefaction without the expectation of reciprocity (cf. the speech's body in Lk 6.32-45).³¹ Rhetorical impetus to embrace this model of discipleship is accentuated by the enthymematic rationale at the end of the first segment of the speech's body;

²⁹Specific attention has been given to the summary statements in Acts (2.41-47; 4.32-37; 5.12-16) regarding the Jerusalem Christian community. See, e.g., Alan C. Mitchell, "The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44-47 and 4:32-37," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 255-72; Maria Anicia Co, "The Major Summaries in Acts: Acts 2,42-47; 4,32-35; 5,12-16 Linguistic and Literary Relationship," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 68 (1992) 49-85; Sterling, "'Athletes of Virtue'," 679-96.

³⁰See, e.g., John H. Elliott, "Patronage and Clientage," in *Social Sciences*, 144-57; Halvor Moxnes, "New Community in Luke-Acts," in *Social World*, 241-68; Craig S. Keener, "Friendship," in *New Testament Background*, 380-88.

³¹See, e.g., Mary Ann Beavis, "'Expecting Nothing in Return': Luke's Picture of the Marginalized," *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 357-68; Balch, "Rich and Poor," 214-33; Green, *Theology*, 76-94, 117-21.

authorial readers who do not embrace this new symbolic construct stand in contradistinction with God (cf. Lk 6.36). The third speech of the Galilean ministry further emphasizes this *topos* in that the ministries of Jesus and John the Baptist to tax collectors and sinners involves non-reciprocal benefaction, with neither demanding – or even expecting – reciprocity from the clients. The rhetorical conclusion for authorial readers who fail to share their possessions is that they not only stand at odds with God but in opposition to Jesus and John the Baptist. This *topos* is corroborated with both positive and negative examples in Luke-Acts, characters or character groups who provide models of behavior to emulate or reject. The rhetorical result is the same here: authorial readers who provide benefaction without concern for reciprocity embody the words and actions of exemplars within the narrative,³² whereas those who fail to do so fall into the same sowing taxonomy containing the characters and character groups who coincide with one of the first three sowing taxonomies in the final Galilean ministry speech.³³

Authorial readers in positions of poverty welcome the narrative discourse and its dissolution of the encumbrances involving benefaction (viz., the need for reciprocity when benefaction is extended). According to the rhetorical argument of the second speech of the Galilean ministry, coupled with the larger narrative discourse, the

³²E.g., the centurion in Lk 7.1-10; Zacchaeus in Lk 19.1-10; the destitute widow in Lk 21.1-4; Joseph of Arimathea in Lk 23.50-56; the Jerusalem Christian community in Acts 2.41-47 and 4.32-37; Barnabas in Acts 4.32-37; the ministry to the Hellenistic widows in Acts 6.1-6; Tabitha in Acts 9.36-43; the Christian community in Antioch in Acts 11.27-30; Lydia in Acts 16.11-15; the Asiarchs in Acts 19.30-31; Mnason of Cyprus in Acts 21.15; Publius in Acts 28.7-10; Christian communities surrounding Rome in Acts 28.11-16.

³³E.g., the rich fool who stored his grain in Lk 12.13-21; the rich ruler in Lk 18.18-30; the scribes in Lk 20.45-47; Judas in Lk 22.1-6; Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5.1-11; Simon the Magician in Acts 8.9-24; the owners of the Philippian slave girl in Acts 16.16-40; Demetrius and Ephesian craftsmen in Acts 19.23-41.

Christian community offers fictive kinship and friendship without the stipulations of reciprocity that accompany traditional modes of patronage. Consequently, authorial readers in need of material support expect to receive non-reciprocal benefaction from other members of the Christian community – fictive friends and kin who are compelled to use their possessions to the benefit of others (cf. Acts 6.1-6).

4.3 Expansion of Religious and Ethnic Boundaries

Because of the volatility of religion and ethnicity in the first and second centuries CE, the religious and ethnic locations of authorial readers are an important facet for consideration in the appropriation of New Testament texts.³⁴ Whether an authorial reader is Jewish, a Godfearer,³⁵ or a Gentile affects appropriation. Each of these three constructs – which can be broken down into further granularity (e.g., Hellenistic women, Godfearers with material possessions, etc.) – embody certain ideological systems that impact the intersection of textual and readerly horizons. In particular, religious and ethnic ideology, as I will argue, plays a pivotal role in the rhetorical texture of the four Galilean ministry speeches.

³⁴The literature is vast on Judaism and Hellenism in the first century CE (e.g., see Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974]; Mary E. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian* [Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 20; Leiden: Brill, 1976]; John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* [New York: Crossroad, 1986].

³⁵I concur with those who argue in favor of the existence of Godfearers in the first century CE (cf. James A. Overman, “The God-Fearers: Some Neglected Features,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 [1988] 17-26; Max Wilcox, “The ‘God-Fearers’ in Acts – A Reconsideration,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 13 [1981] 10-22). For the opposing view, cf. A. Thomas Krabel, “The Disappearance of the ‘God-fearers’,” *Numen* 28 (1981) 113-23.

The synagogue background for the first speech is a familiar setting for Jewish and Godfearer authorial readers. The intertextual examples Jesus cites buttress his refusal to show patronage to his family and friends (Lk 4.25-27). What the speech accomplishes is to place Jesus' message and actions and the message and actions of Elisha and Elijah in continuity with the realities of much of the Christian movement at the end of the first century CE, one increasingly comprised of Gentiles rather than Jews. Intertextual linkages to the LXX circumvent potential Jewish counter arguments opposed to a heterogeneous community by laying claim to the very *topos* (viz., the LXX) that would serve as the rhetorical basis for the opposing view. Characterization within the first speech draws sharp boundaries for the implied reader: those who do not accept Jesus' ministry and message affiliate themselves with the friends and family of his hometown synagogue and moreover repudiate Jesus' interpretation of the LXX Elisha and Elijah traditions. For a Jewish authorial reader this presents a perplexing rhetorical conundrum: how can she or he espouse an alternative or opposing view and remain in congruence with the LXX prophetic traditions?

The rhetorical argument of the first speech both disorients and confronts the ideological protocols and beliefs of a Jewish authorial reader. Disorientation occurs because of Jesus' failure to show appropriate honor in accordance with the cultural codes of benefaction. The synagogue setting for the speech accentuates the affront for a Jewish authorial reader, with the nuances of Jesus' failure to show the honor due to his family and friends in the depicted scene patently obvious to the authorial reader. Confrontation takes place in that the divine preference for the Jewish people over Gentiles is repudiated vis-à-vis the LXX examples of Elisha and Elijah.

Unlike the disorientation and confrontation of the Jewish authorial reader, a Gentile authorial reader experiences confirmation – corroboration of her or his religious heritage, one that has precedence within the religious history of the Jewish people. As a Godfearer authorial reader embraces the religious belief systems of Judaism, the disorientation and confrontation felt by a Jewish authorial reader also apply in her or his case. The Godfearer authorial reader concurrently experiences confirmation, however, in that the inclusion and equal position of Gentiles within the Christian community is affirmed by the rhetorical argument of the first Galilean ministry speech.

The *topos* of the second Galilean ministry speech does not focus on religious ideology, but rather on cultural systems involving benefaction. The rhetorical argument of the third speech, however, includes remonstrance against the Pharisees and lawyers, whereby the implied reader is compelled to view both entities in a negative manner. This occurs via carefully placed enthymematic argument – which includes intratextual and intertextual linkages through which the implied author incites the implied reader to view both character constructs negatively. For all three religious and ethnic authorial readerly constructs – Jewish, Godfearer, and Gentile – the rhetorical discourse evokes a negative judgment towards rabbinic Judaism through its caricature of the Pharisees and lawyers. This certainly fits into a late first-century CE Jewish setting, in which different constituents – the Christian movement being one – were vying for recognition as the rightful heirs to the Jewish religious establishment that was extinguished with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.³⁶ The rhetorical result is that the Jewish intra-

³⁶The literature is vast – see, e.g., Stanley G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) esp 169-94; William Horbury, *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) esp 127-99.

communal debate regarding the legitimacy of the Christian movement is quelled for Jewish and Godfearer authorial readers; the Christian movement is the legitimate heir *contra* the claims of rabbinic Judaism.

Through its various character taxonomies, the final speech of the Galilean ministry engenders metaphorical comparison for the authorial audience, with each ethnic entity gravitating towards those characters and character groups representing their own ethnic background.³⁷ Jewish authorial readers envision characters and character groups such as Jewish actors in the birth narratives of John the Baptist and Jesus (Lk 1.5-2.52); women disciples (Lk 8.1-3); the Good Samaritan (Lk 10.25-37); Barnabas (Acts 4.32-37); Philip (Acts 8.26-40; 21.8); Jews of Beroea (Acts 17.10-15); and Crispus, the synagogue ruler, and other Corinthians (Acts 18.1-11) as exemplar; Godfearer authorial readers embrace characters and character groups such as the centurion with the ill servant (Lk 7.1-10), the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8.26-40), Cornelius (Acts 10.1-11.18), Lydia (Acts 16.11-15), and Timothy (Acts 16.1-3) as exemplar; and Gentile authorial readers associate characters and character groups – which includes those envisioned by Godfearer authorial readers in addition to others with no prior Jewish background – such as Sergius Paulus (Acts 13.4-12), the Gentiles of Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13.13-52), Athenians (viz., Dionysius the Areopagite and Damaris in Acts 17.16-34), and the Ephesian Christians (Acts 19.1-41; 20.17-38) as exemplar. Characters and character groups that each of the three religious authorial readers dismiss as role models – namely, those who fall into the first three sowing activities as defined in the fourth Galilean speech – stand as models not to emulate.

³⁷Cf. Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), esp. 359-79, who pinpoints the relevance of understanding reading *while* it happens.

4.4 Jesus, John the Baptist, and Their Disciples

The narrative discourse of Luke-Acts pays specific heed to the demarcation of differences between Jesus and John the Baptist, with the latter assuming a subservient role to the former. There is evidence that the John the Baptist movement continued into the fourth century CE and quite possibly would have been an issue for the authorial audience of Luke-Acts.³⁸ The third speech of the Galilean ministry serves a two-fold apologetic function: positioning Jesus and his disciples above John the Baptist and his disciples, and then situating both Jesus and John the Baptist above the Pharisees and lawyers.

For authorial readers, whether simply those with questions regarding the relationship between the Christian movement and that of John the Baptist or those actually with a heritage extending back to John the Baptist, the rhetorical argument of the third speech serves as an interpretive key. In the case of those authorial readers merely with questions regarding the relationship of John the Baptist and Jesus, the rhetorical texture provides confirmation, demarcating the symbolic systems of Jesus' message and ministry as superior to those comprising the symbolic world of John the Baptist's disciples. For those authorial readers with a lineage rooted in the heritage of John the Baptist, the rhetorical texture both confirms and disorients. Confirmation occurs in the alignment of Jesus' ministry and message with that of John the Baptist. Disorientation takes place at the level of the narrative as well as belief systems and

³⁸See C.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 187-202, for adumbration of the John the Baptist movement to the fourth century CE. As to the relevance of the John the Baptist movement for the authorial audience, see Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Sacra Pagina, 5; Collegeville: Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1992) 338; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2 vol., 233-34.

actual practices. In the case of the narrative, the birth narratives place John the Baptist in a subservient role, a precursor to Jesus (Lk 1.5-2.52), a thread that unravels through the narrative (see Acts 1.5; 11.16; 13.25), culminating in the episodes of Apollos (Acts 18.24-28) and the disciples of John the Baptist (Acts 19.1-7). In regard to belief systems and actual practices, up until the third speech the implied author provides indirect detail regarding the belief systems and practices of John the Baptist and his followers. In the third speech, specifically the body (Lk 7.31-34), the implied author delimits the differences between Jesus and John the Baptist in the caricature attributed to both by the Pharisees and lawyers: John the Baptist is an ascetic, whereas Jesus is the exact opposite. Further elaboration on the differences between the Christian movement and the movement of John the Baptist is found in the episodes of Apollos (Acts 18.24-28) and the disciples of John the Baptist (Acts 19.1-7). The deficiency is not in the ascetic lifestyle of John the Baptist and his disciples, but rather in the absence of the Holy Spirit in the conversion experience of his disciples – proof, per the implied author, of one being a Christian (cf. Acts 11.17). Notwithstanding, the rhetorical deduction for the implied reader is that the belief systems and practices of Jesus, who is superior to John the Baptist, take precedence over those of John the Baptist and are to be followed in the present day.

The rhetorical power of the narrative discourse upon authorial readers is evident here: disciples of Jesus are superior to those of John the Baptist. The position of the former complies with the authoritative tradition – primarily from the standpoint of *logos* – and the latter fails to do so. Over time, evolution of this intra-communal rhetorical argument lays the foundation for subsequent inter-communal rhetorical

argument, with the end result being the dissolution of the John the Baptist movement and triumph of Christianity.

4.5 Hermeneutical Appropriation and Gender Dimensions

Much has been written on the role of gender in the New Testament during the past decade, ranging from narratological analyses, to ideological assessments, to actual deconstruction. Interest in feminist criticism has prompted much of the investigation. With a significant amount of “footage” portraying women characters and character groups, as well as *topoi* involving activities of concern to women, Luke-Acts has received notable attention.³⁹ A pivotal step in the hermeneutical assessment of the narrative discourse from the standpoint of gender should include its rhetorical effects upon authorial readers – not as a one-dimensional construct but as a polyvalent composite of different entities.

Notwithstanding, the rhetorical texture of the four Galilean ministry speeches engenders very little that directly positions gender as a pivotal aspect of appropriation. The only instance in the four speeches is the LXX intertextual example of Elijah and

³⁹The Lukan portrayal of women is contested and includes (1) those who contend the narrative discourse reflects traditional patriarchal structures (e.g., Jacob Jervell, “The Daughters of Abraham: Women in Acts,” in *The Unknown Paul* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984] 146-57); (2) those who argue that the narrative discourse is diminutive and suppresses the roles and stories of women (e.g., Robert M. Price, *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist Critical Scrutiny* [Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 155; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997]; Richter I. Reimer, *Women in the Acts of the Apostles* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996]); (3) those who find evidence that the narrative challenges patriarchal structures (Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals*, 24-117); and (4) those who suggest the narrative discourse both reflects and challenges gender protocols (i.e., conforms with while challenging social codes) (e.g., Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke and Acts* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994]; Witherington, *Acts*, 334-39). My methodological understanding that the narrative discourse concurrently reflects and confronts ideological frameworks supports the fourth view (i.e., the Lukan portrayal of women, while embedded within cultural constraints, pushes for an expanded role for women).

the widow of Zarephath in the first speech (4.25-26), which creates a narrative trajectory that reaches back to prior narrative and extends forward into the narrative discourse of Luke and then Acts. The result of this analeptic and proleptic activity is the construction of a *topos* revealing an interest that emphasizes non-reciprocal benefaction towards economically and socially disadvantaged women⁴⁰ and characterization of women as exemplars of faith ⁴¹

Women authorial readers in positions of economic and social disadvantage take solace in knowing that the Christian community is tasked with the responsibility of providing material support. In particular, the implied reader constructs a *topos* around the need for benefaction to widows via the rhetorical discourse of the first speech – namely, the LXX intertextual example of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath (4.25-26, with linkage to 1 Kgs 17.17-24). The episode of the widow of Nain in Lk 7.11-17 builds upon this *topos*, with the earlier intratext in the first speech providing the basis for the consistency building. The episode involving the apostolic decision and commissioning to show benefaction to the Hellenistic widows in Acts 6.1-6 provides actual specifics involving ministry to widows. Interestingly, per the episode of Tabitha (Acts 9.36-43), this benefaction has no gender boundaries, with action required of both men and women.⁴² At the same time, women authorial readers are emboldened by the

⁴⁰Cf. Lk 7.11-17; 7.36-50; 13.10-17; Acts 6.1-6; 16.16-19.

⁴¹Cf. Lk 1.5-25; 1.26-38, 46-56; 10.38-42; 18.1-8; 21.1-4; Acts 9.36-43; 12.12-17; 16.11-15, 40; 17.34; 18.1-4, 18-21.

⁴²Ostracization of family members and friends who convert to Christianity is a likely possibility. The narrative situation behind Acts 6.1-6 probably reflects a situation where kinship ties have been severed. On the farthest extremities of society, widows, who relied upon the benefaction of family and friends, would suffer the greatest in this scenario. Ostracization would have the greatest effect upon Hellenistic widows, who, with a much smaller ethnographic support network in the Christian community, would have been in the greatest

narrative discourse to emulate women characters and character groups whose actions coincide with the fourth sowing taxonomy – non-reciprocal benefaction in the form of using possessions to support the Christian community (e.g., Lk 2.36-39; 8.1-3; 21.1-4; Acts 2.41-47; 4.32-37; 9.36-43; 12.12–19; 16.11-15, 40; 17.34; 18.1-4). Women are also held responsible for their benefaction (or failure to do so), with the characterization of Sapphira (Acts 5.1-11) serving as the basis for judgment (also, cf. Acts 13.50-52).⁴³

To take the argument one step further, for both men and women authorial readers, the rhetorical texture of the first speech forms a *topos* with the overarching narrative discourse of Luke-Acts that delimits non-reciprocal benefaction to women in positions of disadvantage such as the widow. An intertextual repertoire demarcating a history of divine benefaction and community benefaction reenforces this aspect of the discourse.⁴⁴ Disorientation occurs in that benefaction – *contra* the intertextual LXX linkages – now has no cultural boundaries, whether for men or women, an element accentuated by the episode in Acts 6.1-6, a *topos* that extends from the LXX intertextual example concerning Elijah in the first speech (Lk 4.25-26).

need of support. See Craig S. Keener, *Bible Background Commentary* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1993) 338.

⁴³Much has been written on the characterization of Sapphira (e.g., Daniel Marguerat, “La mort d’Ananias et Sapphira (Ac 5,1-11),” *New Testament Studies* 39 [1993] 209-26; Henriette Havelaar, “Hellenistic Parallels to Acts 5.1-11 and the Problem of Conflicting Interpretations,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 67 [1997] 62-82). Intertextual parallels between the episode in Acts 5.1-11 and the episode involving Achan in Josh 7 (viz., selfish accumulation of material possessions without concern for the larger community, deception when confronted with that behavior, and the resulting punishment) – also, cf. Adam and Eve in Gen 3 – prompt the implied reader to judge Sapphira through the lens of this prior intertext.

⁴⁴F. Scott Spencer, “Neglected Widows in Acts 6:1-7,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994) 715-33.

What the four Galilean ministry speeches do not provide is a framework for understanding the roles of women in the Christian community beyond the context of female space. Discourse enforcing or challenging existing ideological systems in the female space must be sought beyond the four speeches.⁴⁵ The most that can be said is that the speeches present a *topos* focused on dissemination of the gospel to the disenfranchised, which, construed from the ideological viewpoint of the first century CE, included significant numbers of women.

5 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

While the constructs of author and text demarcate boundaries around hermeneutical appropriation, the authorial audience, as a composite of differing ideological locations, precludes the identification of meaning that is one-dimensional. Rather, in the case of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry, authorial readers, depending on their cultural frameworks, appropriate the narrative in differing ways. Cultural systems involving gender, ethnicity, wealth, and other ideological constructs – all of which comprise the authorial audience – affect how the narrative discourse is assembled and then construed: what pieces are seen as most important?

⁴⁵Within the overall narrative of Luke-Acts, as discussed in chapter nine, women disciples are depicted as exemplars of faith – with their characterization coinciding with the fourth sowing activity from the fourth Galilean ministry speech – and stand in contradistinction with other characters and character groups who fail to exhibit “true” discipleship. The episode receiving the most attention concerning women disciples and the female space is that of Mary and Martha in Lk 10.38-42. There are disparate views as to whether the narrative texture bolsters androcentric ideological systems (see, e.g., Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* [Boston: Beacon Press, 1992] 52-76), or presents a more egalitarian view of women – namely, Mary’s actions of engaging in the role of a student embodies a role ascribed to men and not women (Loveday C.A. Alexander, “Sisters in Adversity: Retelling Martha’s Story,” in *Women in Biblical Tradition*, ed. George J. Brooke [Studies in Women in Religion, 31; Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992] 167-86; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 433-37).

what actions are prompted by the rhetorical argument? which individuals and groups are empowered (and which individuals and groups lose power)? In particular, the implied author draws upon enthymematic argument to guide the implied reader – and thus the authorial audience – in generating differing modes of appropriation. Deductive filling of the gaps in the enthymematic logic and metaphoric images culled by the narrative serves as the basis for corroborating and altering existing symbolic systems of authorial readers. Appropriation of the same narrative discourse varies based on the cultural composition of the authorial reader, disorienting the ideological systems of one authorial reader, while concurrently confirming the ideological systems of another authorial reader

The ideological systems ensuing from the narrative discourse of Luke-Acts – with particular attention paid to the rhetorical texture and resulting narrative trajectories of the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry – reinterpret cultural modes of benefaction, with an interest in bestowal of honor upon the shameful and non-reciprocal patronage upon those in need. Personages in positions of disadvantage, whether because of gender, lack of possessions, or insufficient social standing (viz., power), are envisioned as the recipients of the aforementioned patronage under the framework of fictive kinship and friendship. The narrative discourse also presents an apologia that positions the Christian movement – *contra* post-70 CE first-century rabbinic Judaism (identified by the narrative discourse as the derivation of the Jewish religious leadership) – as standing in the lineage of LXX tradition. The interpretation – which includes both understanding and action – of the LXX tradition by the Christian community is juxtaposed with the interpretation of the LXX tradition by the Jewish religious leadership. In regard to Christian tradition, also in the form of apologia, Jesus

and his disciples are superior to John the Baptist and his disciples; the latter of which simply served as a precursor to the former.

PART FOUR:
CONCLUDING SUMMARY – FROM GALILEE TO ROME

11

CONCLUSION: RHETORICAL TEXTURE, NARRATIVE TRAJECTORIES, AND APPROPRIATION BY AUTHORIAL READERS

Very few investigations of the four speeches of Jesus from the Galilean ministry approach them from the standpoint of ancient Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions. My preceding examination shows, however, how the four speeches exhibit discernible rhetorical texture that corroborates the narrative movement of Luke-Acts. Analysis reveals an implied author who is heavily reliant upon Greco-Roman rhetorical conventions, with the rhetorical texture of the speeches pivotal in guiding the implied reader in the construction of trajectories associated with plot, theme, characterization, and various *topoi*. The argument of the speeches is both deductive and inductive, with the implied author using maxims, enthymemes, rhetorical questioning, intratextual repetition, intertextual examples and echoes, and extratextual repertoire to elicit certain judgments by the implied reader. In the end, the rhetorical texture and resulting narrative trajectories propel the Lukan story from the “backwaters” of the world (Galilee) to the very center of the world (Rome).¹

¹For a discussion of the narrative movement from Galilee to Rome, see Alexander, “Narrative Maps,” 17-57.

Also largely absent in scholarly discussion – not only in regard to the four speeches of Jesus in the Galilean ministry but biblical studies as a whole – is movement beyond looking at hermeneutical appropriation by the initial audience from merely the vantage of a one-dimensional construct to one that envisions a multidimensional audience. Specifically, differences in the cultural location of authorial readers affect what meaning-making dimensions arise from the act of hermeneutical appropriation. My examination of the four Galilean ministry speeches from this hermeneutical lens demonstrates how the same rhetorical texture and narrative trajectories have diverging hermeneutical effects, confirming the ideological location of one authorial reader while altering, reinterpreting, or even confronting that of another.

Several core facets of understanding regarding the implied author, implied reader, and authorial audience emerge from my analysis of the four speeches. The first and second areas pertain to the rhetorical texture of the speeches and their coherence in the formation of narrative trajectories. Another concerns a redactional comparison and how Lukan use of the source materials corroborates a rhetorical focus. The final area relates to the final part of my investigation – authorial readers and hermeneutical appropriation equal polyvalent dimensions of meaning-making.

1 CONCLUDING COMMENTS ON RHETORICAL TEXTURE

1.1 First Galilean Ministry Speech (Lk 4.14-30)

The first speech (Lk 4.14-30) establishes Jesus' *ethos*, placing his ministry and message within the context of the prophetic ministries and messages of Elijah and Elisha, while simultaneously delineating the parameters of his own ministry and message: Jesus adopts a new ethical mode of patronage that reinterprets traditional

boundaries of kinship and friendship, one that extends spiritual and material benefaction to the disenfranchised, those deemed shameful and unclean such as the widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian. Rhetorical arrangement of the speech, using chiasm (vv.18-20) and parallelism (vv.25-27), accentuates the apex of the rhetorical argument for the implied reader in the form of the chiasmic center (viz., Jesus' identification of the lection and reading in v.17b) and the climax of both parallels (viz., repetition of εἰ μὴ in regard to the widow of Zarephath in v.26 and Naaman the Syrian in v.27). As such, the interpretive framework for the *topos* of the speech (delineated by the intertext cited by Jesus in vv.18-19) is provided by the ultima of both parallels – preaching to the πτωχοῖς (“poor”) equals the material and spiritual benefaction of Elijah to the widow of Zarephath and that of Elisha to Naaman the Syrian.

1.2 Second Galilean Ministry Speech (Lk 6.17-49)

The second speech (Lk 6.17-49), the longest and most elaborate of the four speeches, posits a foundation for the disposition and behavior of disciples who aspire to embrace Jesus' ministry and message. A *topos* of reversal – established by the introduction (vv.20-26) and then elaborated upon in the statement of case (vv.27-31) and body (vv.32-45) – permeates its largely deductive rhetorical argument, with maxims and enthymemes comprising the bulk of its rhetorical argument; only the rationale for the body (vv.43-45) and the conclusion (vv.46-49) tap the often-used Lukan inductive parabolic example. The speech breaks down the reciprocal boundaries surrounding benefaction in ancient Greco-Roman culture, an interaction between

clients and patrons that demanded reciprocity – both negative (with affronts to honor) and positive (with the extension of patronage). The rhetorical argument addresses the need to demonstrate non-reciprocal benefaction to those who disrespect the reciprocal protocols of benefaction by failing to show honor (first segment of the body in 6.32-36) and the requisite to extend benefaction without any expectation of reciprocity (second segment of the body in 6.37-42). The end result is egalitarian kinship and friendship without boundaries.

1.3 Third Galilean Ministry Speech (7.24-35)

The third speech (7.24-35) serves as a commentary on the relationship (viz., *ethos*) of Jesus and John the Baptist as well as their disciples, which are designated as offspring (τέκνον) of the divine (σοφία) (per v.35). The rhetorical situation of the speech is rendered in the prior scene (7.18-23), an amplified chreia that posits Jesus' identity at its crux via the chreia (v.21) and its paraphrase (v.22). The "children" (τέκνον) of the divine is an open-ended designate in the narrative, demanding the activity of the implied reader, whereby those deemed as "children of God" are those who embody the disposition and behavior demanded by Jesus' ministry and message. Inclusion of a narrative aside (vv.29-30) following the statement of case (v.28) prompts the implied reader to evaluate the *ethos* of the Pharisees and lawyers – the opponents of Jesus and John the Baptist depicted in the body (vv.31-34). The implied author uses *logos* to demonstrate the fallacious nature of their *logos*; Jesus' actions mirror the accusations they cite against John the Baptist, whereas John the Baptist's actions coincide with the accusations they cite against Jesus.

1.4 Fourth Galilean Ministry Speech (8.4-18)

The final speech (8.4-18) provides a four-fold interpretive characterization matrix from which the implied reader assesses various characters and character groups within the narrative discourse. The overarching rhetorical argument of the speech exhibits a high degree of attention to repetition, with similarities contributing to a crescendo in the fourth sowing example – both in the introduction (vv.5-8a) and body (vv.11-15) – and variations providing the implied reader with “gaps” that help accentuate certain aspects of the discourse. In particular, repetition of ἀκούω (“hearing”) and λόγος (“word”), a *topos* established in the conclusion of the second speech (6.46-49), demarcates listening to Jesus’ message as a true test of discipleship. However, simply listening to Jesus’ message is insufficient. The statement of case (vv.9-10) pinpoints the need for “interpretation” (συνίζω), a *topos* that reaches back to the Lukan prologue (1.4), as a pivotal ingredient in the maturation process that leads to the production of fruit. Descriptive information associated with each of the four sowing activities provides the implied reader with a four-fold taxonomic grid into which characters and character groups are placed based on their words and actions. The conclusion (vv.16-18) draws upon deductive and inductive argument (two enthymemes in the form of examples) to accentuate the incontrovertible *logos* of Jesus’ argument: listening, interpreting, and doing are inseparably tethered.

1.5 Assessing the Rhetorical Texture of the Four Galilean Speeches

The implied author’s use of rhetorical argument is evident in all four speeches, though it is subsumed beneath the immediate narrative context. In particular, stringent

compliance with rhetorical conventions is sacrificed in favor of the need to move the narrative discourse forward. The most obvious example is in the case of the first speech, in which the vitriolic reaction of the hometown synagogue crowd (4.28-30) serves as a premature interruption to the speech; the end result being that Jesus is unable to deliver the conclusion of the speech due to the actions of the crowd. Another notable instance is that Jesus' speeches appear as riposte in various instances to questions posed by characters from the narrative (e.g., 4.22; 7.18-23; 8.9). Not only does this help integrate the speeches into the overall narrative discourse, bringing continuance and sequential movement, but it contributes to the overall *ethos* of the implied author in that it breathes "accuracy" (cf. "ἀκριβῶς" in Lk 1.3) and "veracity" (cf. ἀσφάλεια in Lk 1.4) to that being represented in the narrative.

The four speeches affirm the growing understanding that New Testament oratory largely differs from the oratory defined in the Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks. Attempts to define New Testament rhetoric – and in this case the rhetorical argument of Luke-Acts – in terms of invention (viz., the judicial, deliberative, and epideictic *species*) and arrangement defined by the handbook tradition is fruitless.² Rather, it is more accurate to speak in terms of rhetorical texture, with rhetorical proof and style as the key components for analysis.

²See, e.g., the comment of Burton L. Mack (*Rhetoric and the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990] 35): "Most attempts to define precisely the issue of an early Christian argument fail, however, simply because the social circumstances of the early Christian movements did not correspond to the traditional occasions for each type of speech. Early Christian rhetoric was a distinctly mixed bag in which every form of rhetorical issue and strategy was frequently brought to bear simultaneously in an essentially extravagant persuasion."

All three modes of rhetorical proof – *pathos*, *logos*, and *ethos* – are evident in the four speeches. In the case of the first Galilean ministry speech (Lk 4.14-30), the rhetorical proof centers around *pathos*, which culminates in the violent response of the narrative audience (i.e., their attempt to kill Jesus). *Logos* is not absent from the rhetorical argument, however; the implied author employs careful deductive and inductive reasoning to move the implied reader to equate Jesus with the figures of Elijah and Elisha. The second speech (6.17-49) uses *logos* to compel the implied reader to embrace the disposition and behavior demanded by Jesus' ministry and message. The third speech (7.24-35) uses *logos* as the basis of its argument by drawing heavily upon *synkrisis* and *ecphrasis* in its exaltation of John the Baptist and denunciation of those opposed to the ministries and messages of John the Baptist and Jesus. The final speech (8.4-18) utilizes *synkrisis* and *ecphrasis* in its four sowing activities that culminates with the fourth sowing activity.

Actual rhetorical style in the four speeches displays an attentiveness to intratextual cohesion via repetition – both in terms of connectivity within each speech as well as with the overall narrative discourse. In addition, rhetorical style extends from the narrative discourse as a means for not only heightening the impact of certain contextual expressions and statements but guiding the implied reader to connect the rhetorical argument of each speech to components such as plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi*. The implied author also reveals a predilection for both inductive reasoning – through the use of aphorisms and metaphoric examples – and deductive reasoning – through the use of rhetorical questioning, maxims, and enthymemes. A distinct differentiation between inductive and deductive argumentation

is not evident, however, in that the discourse is replete with enthymemes embedded as components of parabolic examples. Abduction also forms part of the rhetorical argument, serving as the rationale for ethical enactment – ethical action is a derivative of the divine nature and actions.³ This argument by abduction functions as a mode of rhetorical power; readers who are not willing to embrace the conclusions of the narrative discourse are rhetorically positioned as in opposition to the divine.

2 CONCLUDING COMMENTS ON NARRATIVE TRAJECTORIES

The first speech (4.14-30) establishes Jubilee-like benefaction – specifically assistance to the disenfranchised (“preaching good news to the poor”) – as the constituent theme of Luke-Acts and plot driver (4.18-19). The rhetorical situation of the second speech (6.17-19) culls a ministry context reminiscent of the first speech (cf. 4.18-19). Specifically, the introduction, in its *topos* of reversal of fortunes, echoes the benefactory enactment of Jubilee (6.20-26). The rhetorical situation of the third speech (7.24-35), vis-à-vis the preceding amplified chreia (7.18-23), recalls the same *topos* couched in terms of a LXX intertext (specifically v.22). The final speech (8.4-18), with its emphasis upon listening and then enactment of Jesus’ message, forms an intratextual connection with the conclusion of the second speech (6.46-49). As such, intratextual linkages between all four speeches direct the implied reader in building coherence from the narrative. The narrative components include theme and plot, characterization, and *topoi*.

³Viz., the rationale for the first segment of the body in the second speech (6.36) and the statement of case (7.28) and conclusion (7.35) of the third speech.

2.1 Theme and Plot

The theme of “salvation to the ends of the earth” and the underlying plot substructure is afforded significant impetus by the four Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus. The first speech serves as the definition: salvific benefaction is to be extended to those who are materially and spiritually disenfranchised. This is a new ethical mode of benefaction in that cultural boundaries are oblivious to Jesus and his followers. The second speech elaborates upon its dimensions by demarcating the implications: benefaction is shown without regard for reciprocity. The *ethos* of Jesus’ teaching about and enactment of “salvation to the ends of the earth” is corroborated by the third speech, which, in contradistinction to the Pharisees and lawyers, positions Jesus, John the Baptist, and their disciples in accordance with the divine. Based on the final speech, salvific benefaction is something humans eventuate through actions shown to others – it is more than a disposition of listening (ἀκούω) or even interpreting (συνίζω).

2.2 Characterization

2.2.1 Jesus

The Galilean ministry establishes the foundation for Jesus’ characterization, with the first and third speeches at the crux of the implied reader’s construction. *Synkrisis* of Jesus’ first speech (cf. 4.24-27) and subsequent actions (cf. 7.1-10, 11-17) results in the implied reader locating Jesus in the lineage of the prophetic ministries of Elijah and Elisha: their ministry to those outside cultural boundaries coincides with Jesus’ salvific benefaction to the disenfranchised. At the same time, Jesus is seen as transcending traditional modes of kinship and friendship, in that his acts of benefaction

are *not* toward family and friends (cf. 4.23) but to outsiders, those beyond the personages who would exhibit honor and patronage. The rhetorical situation of Jesus' second speech (6.17-19) places his actions alongside those of Moses and, in particular, Moses' giving of the law in Exodus. The third speech positions the characterization of Jesus and his disciples in contradistinction with that of John the Baptist and the characterization of Jesus and John the Baptist in contradistinction with that of their opponents – specifically the Pharisees and lawyers (cf. 7.29-30). The third speech bolsters the characterization of John the Baptist as an ascetic figure whose message and ministry stand in contrast to that of Jesus and his followers. Through deduction, prompted by the query from John the Baptist to Jesus (7.18-20), the implied reader concludes that John the Baptist (in contrast to the implied reader) is not privy to Jesus' divine status. In particular, the implied author assumes an intratextual and intertextual repertoire on the part of the implied reader that equates activities of the expected Messiah with that of Jesus (via deductive argument of the chreia in 7.21 and its paraphrase in 7.22). In addition, the diminutive stature of John the Baptist – in comparison with those who embrace Jesus' message regarding the "kingdom of God" – establishes a *topos* that receives further elaboration with progression of the narrative.⁴

2.2.2 *The "Poor"*

The character stereotype of "poor" – the recipients of salvific benefaction – coalesces around the widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian, both of whom receive salvific benefaction from Elijah and Elisha respectively. Through *synkrisis* with

⁴See Darr, *Character Building*, 60-84.

other characters and character groups who receive salvific benefaction from Jesus and then his disciples, the implied reader constructs a characterization of the “poor” that spans the narrative of Luke and Acts.⁵ These individuals and groups range from those in need of material benefaction (such as the widows in Acts 6.1-6), to those in need of spiritual benefaction (such as Lydia in Acts 16.11-15), to those who are ethnically unclean (such as the centurion in Lk 7.1-10 and Cornelius in Acts 10.1-11.18), to those in need of physical healing (such as paralytic in Lk 5.17-26 or the lame man at the gate of the temple in Acts 3.1-10), to social and/or religious deviants (such as the “sinful” woman in Lk 7.36-50 and Zachaeus in Lk 19.1-10).

2.2.3 *Opponents of Jesus and His Disciples*

Opponents of Jesus and his followers are described in the four speeches as constructing cultural boundaries that inhibit the administration of salvific benefaction. The hometown synagogue crowd in the first speech violently retaliates against Jesus when he refuses to perform miraculous acts of benefaction that he readily dispenses to non-kinsmen and non-friends in Capernaum (4.28-30). The narrative aside in the third speech (7.29-30) provides the implied reader with direct commentary concerning the characterization of the Pharisees and lawyers – namely, they reject the purpose of God by not heeding the message and ministry of John the Baptist (3.1-20). Their characterization stands in contrast to that of the people and tax collectors who did heed the message of John the Baptist and were baptized. The first sowing taxonomy in the final speech (8.5, 11) – the character stereotype certainly representative of opponents of Jesus and his followers – depicts the devil as playing a pivotal role in

⁵See Roth, *Character Types*; Phillips, *Wealth and Poverty*, 95-96, 106-115.

their failure to exhibit discipleship. Proleptic construction of the narrative by the implied reader results in association of various attributes to this stereotype, including animosity towards Jesus and his followers and often a journey ending in spiritual and even physical condemnation.

2.2.4 *Failed Disciples*

Personages who fail to embody the characteristics Jesus ascribes to “true” disciples are metaphorically compared in the second speech to a bad tree that produces bad fruit (first rationale of the body in 6.43-44), bramble bushes that produce thorns (second rationale of the body in 6.45), and a person whose house crumbles during flood because he did not build a foundation (conclusion in 6.49). The final speech, through its characterization matrix, provides the implied reader with further information regarding the portrayal of those who do not embrace Jesus’ call to discipleship. These character stereotypes break into further granularity in that each of the first three sowing activities represent a stereotype that is at odds with the character stereotype of “true” discipleship (as demarcated by the final sowing activity; cf. 8.8, 15).

2.2.5 *Four Sowing Activities Demarcate Four Character Taxonomies*

The implied reader builds coherence around each of the four character stereotypes that are delineated in the final speech. The disposition and actions of each character stereotype is metaphorically represented by the sowing activity with which it is associated. The first stereotype (those sown along the path) represents those characters who “hear” the message but fail to believe (attributed to the devil; cf. 8.5,

11). In the second sowing example, the seed initially grows but withers away due to the lack of moisture. The characters associated with the second stereotype initially demonstrate varying degrees of faithfulness but then fall away due to various temptations (cf. 8.6, 12). In the case of the third example (cf. 8.7, 13), maturation is inhibited and ultimately altogether thwarted. Those characters corresponding with this stereotype exhibit interest in discipleship but, in the end, cannot adhere to the principles ascribed around discipleship because of their desire for honor in the form of possessing wealth. The final sowing activity depicts maturation that occurs over a lengthy period of time and ethical behaviors that eventuate from the heart (cf. 8.8, 15). This stereotype embodies characteristics that stand in contradistinction with the characteristics representative of the first three stereotypes. Their cognitive and moral comportment also coincides with that of God, the Holy Spirit, and Jesus. (See chapter nine for a detailed breakdown of characters and character groups into each of these four taxonomies.)

2.3 *Topoi*

The four speeches carry forward *topoi* established in earlier scenes as well as form new *topoi*, both of which receive elaboration with narrative progression. A significant number of the *topoi* overlap between two or more of the four speeches, resulting in a heightened sense of awareness for the implied reader.

2.3.1 *Topoi Overlapping All Four Galilean Ministry Speeches*

First and foremost, intertwined with the overarching theme and plot line of Luke-Acts, is the reversal of fortunes (directly detailed in the introduction of the

second speech in 6.20-26) and, accordingly, the extension of salvific benefaction to those outside of the parameters of kinship and friendship⁶ – a *topos* corroborated via intertextual linkages in the first speech to Jubilee legislation (Isa 61.1-2; 58.6 and Lk 4.18-19). Discipleship also involves the demonstration of material benefaction (cf. 4.18-19, 25-27; 6.20-26, 27-45) to those in need, particularly those unable to show reciprocity. This leads to a third *topos* of non-reciprocal benefaction (4.23, 25-27; 6.27-45). Disciples are to provide both spiritual and material benefaction without the expectation of patronage; the need to garner honor when providing benefaction is no longer in purview. A fourth *topos* posits that discipleship requires perseverance and necessitates both listening and doing. In particular, the conclusion of the second speech accentuates the importance of following Jesus' directives regarding non-reciprocal benefaction via the *synkrisis* of two metaphorical examples (6.46-49). Further, the rhetorical argument of the fourth speech compares discipleship with the maturation required to produce fruit and contrasts the stereotypes associated with the fourth sowing activity with those of the preceding three (8.5-8a, 11-15). The conclusion of the fourth speech (8.16-18) also incites action through enthymematic *logos*. In the end, the cognitive aspect of conversion in Luke-Acts finds its derivation in the second and fourth speeches, where ethical actions (and thus "true" discipleship) is described as originating from the heart (6.45; 8.15).

⁶Cf. the first and second speeches and their rhetorical argument that reinterpret traditional cultural codes of benefaction. Also key is the narrative aside addressing the ministry activity of Jesus and John the Baptist in 7.29-30.

2.3.2 *Topoi Found in One Speech Only*

Notwithstanding, there are several *topoi* with no overlap between the speeches that remain integral to the narrative discourse. The first speech establishes a four-fold paradigm of proclamation⁷ that serves as a type scene for subsequent scenes involving followers of Jesus, whereby the events are interpreted (via *synkrisis*) by the implied reader through the lens of the paradigm in the first speech. The final speech engenders two *topoi* that prove key in the development of the narrative discourse. Both of the *topoi* are deductive derivations by the implied reader – indirect constructions based on proleptic processing of the narrative. The first is the condemnation of and triumph over divination and magic, modes of benefaction used to engender honor and garner patronage. The *topos* – the deductive result of the identification of character stereotypes in the fourth speech and then comparing their actions against the demarcation of actions appropriate to disciples and non-disciples from the second speech – centers around condemnation of characters who partake in divination and magic and the triumph of disciples over those individuals and groups. A second *topos* relates to the eventual apocalyptic demise for those who repudiate and persecute “true” disciples. Irony also plays a role in the construction of this *topos* in that persecution, rather than thwarting or altogether halting the progression of Jesus and then the Christian movement, typically engenders renewed growth.

⁷See chapter four for a detailed discussion: (1) boldness of proclamation; (2) antithetical response by the audience; (3) “miraculous” escape by the protagonist from an audience seeking to inflict harm; and (4) renewed spread of “salvation.”

3 CONCLUDING COMMENTS ON REDACTIONAL INDICATORS⁸

Redactional activity by the implied author reveals an interest in melding the four speeches into the surrounding narrative discourse – specifically so the argument bolsters plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi*.⁹ The redactional changes – whether additions or permutations – reflect four general categorical tendencies. The first relates to attentiveness of the implied author on orienting the rhetorical argument to the level of the narrative audience and implied reader. The most obvious examples of this are the changes in Lk 6.20-26 from the third-person plural pronoun to the second-person pronoun (Matt 5.3-12). Additionally, the implied author includes a narrative aside to direct the implied reader in making judgments about characters in the immediate narrative discourse (cf. Lk 7.29-30 versus that in Matt 11.7-19).

The second pertains to an interest in fitting the speeches into the overall flow of the narrative discourse. For example, the implied author, in forming an *inclusio* around the final speech (Lk 8.1-3, 19-21), omits the final two parabolic examples and *inclusio*

⁸My analysis assumes the Two Source Document theory – specifically, that the Lukan implied author used two primary sources (Mark and Q) in the composition of Luke. See, e.g., Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark; Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996); Paul M. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Assessment of One Argument for Markan Priority* (Society for New Testament Studies, 94; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). However cf. Alan J. McNicol, David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody, *Beyond the Q Impasse – Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996).

⁹Redactional analysis of the inaugural speech (4.14-30) is more difficult since there are significant differences between it and the apparent source in Mark 6.1-6. For a discussion of the redactional issues, see, e.g., Robert C. Tannehill, “The Mission of Jesus According to Luke IV 16-30,” in *Jesus in Nazareth*, ed. E. Grässer (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972) 51-75. For the second (6.17-49) and third (7.24-35) speeches, the source identified is Q. In the case of the final inaugural speech (8.4-18), Mark stands as the derivative source.

statement from the narrative in Mark (cf. 4.26-34).¹⁰ Perhaps the most notable instance involves the redactional movement of the entire segment on John the Baptist to an earlier place in the narrative sequence (*contra* the later sequential occurrence in Q [cf. Matt. 11.7-19]). The implied author also conflates sources in a few instances in order to build rhetorical impact (e.g., combination of the traditions in Matt 7.17 and 12.35 in 6.43-45, which accentuates the contrast between the “good” and “bad” trees and their produce).

Third, the implied author displays unique awareness in heightening the rhetorical impact of the discourse. This is evident in myriad ways; the most notable ones include: (1) inclusion of the temporal pronoun *vûv* in 6.20-26; (2) insertion of corresponding woes (cf. 6.24-26) to coincide with the preceding blessings (cf. 6.20-23), thereby accentuating the rhetorical theme of reversal; (3) inclusion of “hook” words that prompt a rhetorical transition to the subsequent sowing example in 8.5-8a, 11-15; and (4) downplaying or deleting semantic expressions likely unfamiliar to the implied reader (e.g., contrast between the “wise” and “foolish” person from Matt 7.24-27).¹¹

Finally, redactional activity of the implied author discloses a tendency to modify source material to accentuate *topoi* inherent to the narrative discourse.¹² A

¹⁰In an ironic twist, the implied author of Luke replaces the *inclusio* in Mark (cf. “many things in parables” in Mark 4.2 and “with many such parables” in Mark 4.33), as noted by Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 148.

¹¹There is no instance of the implied author adding Jewish colloquial phrases (see Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 253).

¹²See Witherington, “Editing the Good News,” 324-47, who reaches this conclusion after examining the use of Mark and Q by the implied author as well as the use of the source behind the conversion experience of Saul/Paul in Acts 9, 22, and 26.

good example here is the addition of “woes” (6.24-26) to “blessings” (6.20-23) that results in a parallel juxtaposition of “blessings” (6.20-23) and “woes” (6.24-26). This juxtaposition reflects the Lukan emphasis on reversal of fortunes, a bipolarity found in the theme of Luke-Acts (“salvation to the ends of the earth”) as well as characterization and even *topoi*. (See my above discussion of characterization and *topoi* for detail.)

4 APPROPRIATION BY AUTHORIAL READERS

Biblical scholars largely fail to realize the full implications of the construct of authorial audience by construing hermeneutical appropriation of biblical texts from the position of a one-dimensional readerly construct. I suggest, in contrast, that authorial audiences consist of personages embodying varying ideological systems that affect the meaning-making outcomes of hermeneutical appropriation. The same narrative discourse, as a result, can *confirm* the ideological systems of one authorial reader, while concurrently *disorienting* or even *confronting* those of another.

The nature of ancient Greco-Roman narrative and methodological constraints prevent the demarcation of precise and detailed boundaries around the authorial audience. Instead, I propose identification of general ideological parameters and, in particular, an understanding of Theophilus as providing literary patronage in the form of distributing Luke and then Acts to his social network of family and friends. The derivation is an authorial audience exhibiting different cultural locations. I demonstrate how hermeneutical appropriation of the four Galilean ministry speeches from different readerly constructs produces disparate modes of meaning. In particular, my analysis

shows that narrative discourse affects authorial readers in different ways based on their cultural location.

5 AREAS FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

As with nearly any critical investigation, resolution and clarification gives rise to further questions and areas for future examination. My preceding study prompts the need for additional inquiry in a couple of different areas: (1) an analysis of speeches in the context of the entirety of Luke and Acts and (2) the form and function of speeches in ancient Greco-Roman narrative, with particular focus on speeches that occur at the beginning of narrative stories.

5.1 Luke-Acts: Speeches and Narrative Discourse

As I discussed in chapter one, nearly all of the attention paid to ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric in the two-volume corpus of Luke-Acts centers around the speeches contained in the sequel.¹³ My examination of the Galilean ministry of Jesus highlights the presence of four speeches that exhibit elements of rhetorical texture, ranging from style, to proofs, to arguments. A survey of the remaining speeches in the narrative of Luke from the lens of Greco-Roman rhetoric is still needed. Though not a comprehensive list, some questions of interest include: Is there a pattern in the occurrence and function of speeches by Jesus? What are some of the *topoi* for the rhetorical argument embedded within the speeches? Do these *topoi* reveal ideological systems that can help in adumbrating ideological systems embraced by the implied

¹³The one exception would be the Lukan prologue (1.1-4), which has received significant interest in terms of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric (see, e.g., Vernon K. Robbins, "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies," in *Heritage of Israel*, 63-83).

author? What presupposition protocols does the implied author assume on the part of the implied reader? Do subsequent speeches simply expand upon the narrative trajectories that ensue from the four speeches of the Galilean ministry or do they emplot additional narrative trajectories? In comparison to other ancient Greco-Roman narrative, does Luke, like Acts, exhibit a comparable percentage of speech material versus running narrative? Finally, are there other speeches in Luke-Acts that exhibit earlier tradents such as the third Galilean ministry speech in Lk 7.24-35 that resemble chreia? If so, does the assemblage of these chreia into speech forms by the Lukan implied author reveal redactional attention to certain aspects of rhetorical invention, arrangement, and style? Further, what do these tradents reveal regarding modes of rhetorical argumentation and moreover the ideological beliefs of Q or perhaps other pre-Gospel groups of Christian disciples from which these chreia originated?

The next step in the analysis relates to the need for a comparison of the rhetorical argument of the speeches in Luke to those in Acts. This interpretive step could serve as corroboration either for or against the unity of Luke-Acts, with close correspondence pointing towards unity and the lack of correspondence as evidence for disunity. Areas of coherence or incoherence between the speeches of Luke and Acts include overarching discourse-related issues such as plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi* as well as issues related to rhetorical argument such as proof, modes of argumentation, and assumed presupposition pools. For discourse-related issues, the following are some of the questions that arise: Do the speeches in Acts carry plot and theme forward in the same way as the speeches in Luke? Do the speeches in the initial section of Acts (1.12-8.3) function in a manner similar to the Galilean ministry

speeches in Luke? Are the speeches in Acts used as levers of rhetorical power to prompt the implied reader to positive and negative character judgments? For issues related to rhetorical argument, the following are some of the areas for further investigation: Do the speeches in Acts display the same level and kind of interest in the *ethos* of the early Christian orators as in the case of Jesus' *ethos* in the speeches of Luke? Do the speeches of Acts use argumentation and proof in the same way as the speeches of Luke? For example, are rhetorical questioning, maxims, and enthymemes as prominent in the argument of the speeches of Acts as in the case of the speeches of Luke? Do the speeches in Luke and Acts exhibit the same level of interest in deductive and inductive argumentation?

5.2 Speeches in Ancient Greco-Roman Narrative

While it is acknowledged that Luke-Acts has significantly more speech material than the bulk of other Greco-Roman narrative,¹⁴ it is unclear as to whether the speeches in Luke-Acts play a more prominent role in the emplotment of the narrative discourse than in comparable Greco-Roman narrative. In addition, despite agreement that speeches in antiquity play an integral role in revealing narrative texture to an implied reader, driven by the modernistic desire for historicity, there is an inadequate understanding of the role and function and use of proof and argumentation in speeches. In accordance with this predilection to look at the *world behind the speeches* versus the *world portrayed in them* or even the *world of the reader*, there is insufficient

¹⁴Horsley, "Speeches and Dialogue," 612-13.

analysis regarding speeches that appear in the initial sections of Greco-Roman narrative.¹⁵

The four speeches of the Galilean ministry embody ideological systems that are both shaped by their cultural situation yet reinterpret or even challenge their cultural contexts. Hermeneutical appropriation occurs in both the ways in which the narrative discourse conforms with ideological systems of the authorial audience as well as the ways in which it disorients or even confronts those same ideological systems. In the case of the four speeches of the Galilean ministry, the implied author uses rhetorical texture as a means of persuasive power to move the implied reader to embrace the meaning-making dimensions pronounced by the narrative discourse. Episodes involving healing activity or encounters with opponents serve as exegetical commentary for the rhetorical texture of the speeches.¹⁶ The impetus behind the rhetorical power of the discourse is that the divine exhibits commensurate ideals and actions, with the LXX serving as the basis for reinterpreting the ideological systems in purview. Strict adherence to the cultural constructs of honor and shame inhibit the embrace of demeanor and actions that conform with the ministry and message of Jesus.

At present, without more investigation, it is difficult to compare the speeches of the Lukan Galilean ministry with speeches in Greco-Roman narrative that

¹⁵Clifford Geertz (*The Interpretation of Cultures* [New York: Basic Books, 1973] 3-30) discusses three different interpretive nuances, which he describes as “thick description” – *the world behind the text* (the world of the author), *the world within the text* (the narrated world of characters, intentions, and events), and *the world in front of the text* (the world of the reader).

¹⁶For a similar view, see Staley, “Narrative Structure,” 173-213; idem, “Plotting the Program and Parallels,” 281-302.

inaugurate the events of the story.¹⁷ Some possible questions include: Do speeches in Greco-Roman narrative serve as interpretive grids for discerning plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi*? If so, at what place in the narrative sequence are these typically found? Do speeches in Greco-Roman narrative prompt hermeneutical appropriation through conformance with and deformation of ideological systems and how does this coincide with the surrounding narrative story? Does the rhetorical texture use the demeanor and actions of the gods as the rationale for the acceptance of the rhetorical argument at hand?

6 CONTRIBUTIONS TO OTHER ISSUES IN LUKAN STUDIES

Just as my investigation pinpoints areas for future inquiry, it also contributes to the ongoing discussion of several issues – both those directly related to Lukan studies and those that are more general in scope. Areas of possible illumination include the two contested issues that I discussed in detail in chapter eight – the unity (or disunity) of Luke-Acts and the representation of the Jewish people – as well as implications regarding methodology and hermeneutical appropriation today. One other area is that of the Lukan community and how the results of my investigation potentially contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the initial flesh-and-blood audience of Luke-Acts.

¹⁷Given that the majority of scholars posit ancient historiography containing ethnographic interests as having the closest narrative parallels to Luke-Acts, the logical starting point would be with those narrative texts (e.g., Josephus, 1 Maccabees, 4 Maccabees, 1 Esdras, Dionysius, Polybius).

6.1 Luke-Acts Unity

While most admit the presence of some small “cracks” in regard to the unity of Luke and Acts, few believe the reports of a decade ago that large ruptures had appeared. As I discussed in chapter eight, many of these narrative seams pertain to narrative and readerly concerns. In the case of the four Galilean speeches of Jesus, their rhetorical texture forms various narrative trajectories – related to plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi* – that extend into Acts. A significant number of these saturate the narrative of Acts and thus stand as strong corroboration for Luke-Acts unity. Some of the more obvious instances include: (1) parallels between Lk 4.14-30 and Acts 13.14b-52 – including the presence of a type scene that is echoed in several instances in Acts; (2) correspondence between characterization in Acts and the character taxonomies delineated in Lk 8.4-18 and, to a lesser extent, as detailed in the second Galilean ministry speech in Lk 6.20-49, evaluative criteria for deciphering between faithful and unfaithful discipleship – an element of the narrative discourse that extends from Luke to Acts; (3) potential redactional shortening of the LXX citation – Isa 6.9-10 – in Lk 8.9-10 (cf. Mark 4.12) in Acts 28.28 in order to bring full emphasis on the explanation for centripetal movement towards the Gentiles;¹⁸ (4) the need for a narrative frame – namely, through intratextual links – concerning John the Baptist and his disciples (Lk 1.5-2.52; 3.1-22; 7.18-35) in Acts 19.1-9; (5) discernible interest in speeches and rhetorical texture as a vehicle for delineating important narrative

¹⁸For a discussion of the implications of this redactional maneuver, see François Bovon, “‘How Well the Holy Spirit Spoke Through the Prophet Isaiah to Your Ancestors!’ (Acts 28:25),” in *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narrative*, trans. Jane Haapiseva-Hunter (Princeton Theological Monograph Series, 36; Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwith Press, 1995) 43-50.

signposts for the implied reader in Acts¹⁹ is also visibly present in Luke; and (6) intratextual connections between Lk 4.16-30 – particularly vis-à-vis elements associated with plot, theme, and *topoi* – and various scenes in Acts (2.17-40; 3.11-26; 9.19b-25; 10.34-43; 13.4-12, 14-52),²⁰ including the closing scene in 28.17-28.²¹ Perhaps the most compelling linkages between the four Galilean ministry speeches and the narrative of Acts are reflected in the four elements typically associated with narrative discourse – plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi*. As I demonstrated in chapter nine, the narrative emplotment of these in the four Galilean ministry speeches carries forth into the narrative of Acts; the implied reader builds greater and greater coherence around each of these by means of subsequent narrative. Hence, while some veritable cracks remain regarding the question of Luke-Acts unity, the aforementioned furthers the argument that evidence in favor of unity far outweighs that against unity.

6.2 Representation of the Jewish People

The ongoing scholarly debate concerning the representation of the Jewish people in Luke-Acts is not something that can be resolved within the parameters of this investigation. The rhetorical texture of the four speeches certainly corroborates the conclusion of most that the portrayal of the Jewish people in Luke-Acts is both positive and negative. What an analysis of rhetorical texture – in this case in regard to

¹⁹For the importance of speeches and their rhetorical texture to the narrative discourse of Acts, see Witherington, *Acts*, esp. 39-50, 116-22; Soards, *Speeches in Acts*, 18-207; idem, “Speeches in Acts,” 65-90; Horsley, “Speeches and Dialogue,” 609-14.

²⁰For an overview, see Neirynck, “Luke 4,16-30,” 357-95.

²¹See Dupont, “La conclusion des Actes,” 359-404, for an in-depth examination of the parallels between Lk 4.16-30 and Acts 28.17-28.

a select group of speeches in the narrative – shows is that positive and negative portrayal of different characters and character groups is an embedded component of the rhetorical argument. Of course, this, as noted in chapter three, is consistent with ancient Greco-Roman narrative.²² There are several aspects of my investigation that contributes to the discussion surrounding the representation of the Jewish people in Luke-Acts.

6.2.1 *First Galilean Ministry Speech*

Jesus' refusal to show the same type of benefaction he dispensed to individuals outside of the boundaries of kinship and friendship in Capernaum to his friends and family in Nazareth (Lk 4.14-37) is a rhetorical argument: the salvation of God is not only for friends and family – per cultural protocols accepted by the narrative audience and implied reader – but for all who are willing to embrace the “way” (ὁδός) of discipleship. The discourse is negative in that Jewish people – as represented by Jesus' hometown synagogue crowd – who oppose this permutation in ethnic, religious, and social boundaries are placed by the implied author in a position of opposing the divine (as represented by Jesus and his message and ministry).²³ The LXX examples of Elisha and Elijah, in accordance with argument in ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric (i.e., *synkrisis*), simply corroborate (as part of the body – Lk 4.23-27) the basis of the

²²See Kenneth S. Sacks, “Rhetorical Approaches to Greek History Writing,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984) 123-33; Robbins, “Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric,” 368-84.

²³The rhetorical invention of proof uses *ethos* as a means of bolstering the character of the rhetor and denigrating the character of her or his opponents (see, e.g., William W. Fortenbaugh, “Aristotle on Persuasion Through Character,” *Rhetorica* 10 [1992] 207-44).

speech (viz., the statement of case – Lk 4.21-22) by demonstrating continuity with LXX traditions held as authoritative by both the narrative audience and implied reader.

6.2.2 *Second Galilean Ministry Speech*

The second Galilean ministry speech does not directly address the characterization of the Jewish people. It does provide, however, a commentary on the first Galilean ministry speech, demarcating ethical behavior that corroborates the rhetorical discourse of the first speech; an ideological framework that espouses non-reciprocal benefaction. As such, the implied reader, like Jesus, castigates the hometown synagogue crowd in Nazareth, not for their Jewishness, but rather for the fact that they embrace a model of benefaction that anticipates reciprocity – one that exhibits honor to friends and family and shame towards those outside of the boundaries of kinship and friendship.

6.2.3 *Third Galilean Ministry Speech*

The third Galilean ministry speech follows two episodes that serve as type scenes, corresponding with the Elisha and Elijah examples found in the body of the first Galilean ministry speech (Lk 4.25-27): the episode involving the healing of the centurion's servant represents the Elisha example and the raising of the widow's son at Nain represents the Elijah example. As such, both further define Jesus and his message and ministry for the implied reader and prompt association between Jesus and the prophetic figures of Elisha and Elijah. The questioning of John the Baptist and his disciples in the chreia preceding the third Galilean ministry speech does not depart from this narrative context: the *ethos* of Jesus and his ministry and message are in full

purview. The negative characterization of the Pharisees and scribes in the speech is not a ubiquitous nomenclature for the Jewish people but rather a taxonomy representing the Jerusalem religious leadership.²⁴ The implied reader inductively associates the “children” (παιδίον) in the marketplace who mock both Jesus and John the Baptist with the Pharisees and scribes, particularly since those two groups appear as antagonists in one preceding scene (Lk 5.17-26) and several subsequent scenes (Lk 10.25-37; 11.32-52; 14.1-24). Further, in that the parabolic example of the children in the marketplace connotes a legal (court) setting,²⁵ the implied reader discerns an utter lack of *logos* in the argument of the Pharisees and scribes (viz., they castigate John the Baptist for not exhibiting the behavior of Jesus and Jesus for not exhibiting the behavior of John the Baptist). Hence, negative characterization in the case of the third Galilean ministry speech pertains only to the Jewish leadership – as represented by the Pharisees and scribes – which does not encompass all of the Jewish people.

6.2.4 *Fourth Galilean Ministry Speech*

The apparent redactional decision by the implied author to omit the final clause of the citation from Isa 6.9 in the statement of case of the fourth speech (“lest they should turn again and be forgiven” in Mark 4.12c) of the Galilean ministry (Lk 8.9-10) and then include it in the closing scene of Acts (28.25-27)²⁶ is viewed by some as a

²⁴As argued by Richard A. Horsley, “The Kingdom of God as the Renewal of Israel,” in *Whoever Hears You Hears Me*, 263-66.

²⁵See Cotter, “Children Sitting in the Agora: Q (Luke) 7:31-35,” *Forum* 5 (1989) 63-82; idem, “Children in the Market Place,” 289-304.

²⁶It is important to note that the Lukan implied author reverts to the LXX for the citation in Acts 28.27 versus the redactional source of Lk 8.9-10 in Mark 4.12c in that ἀφ’ ἑνός is used rather than ἰσόμῃ. This reversion to the LXX version may simply reflect that the

final closure and denunciation of the Jewish people – in that the final pronouncement against the Jewish people could not take place until the close of the narrative – and by others as an open-ended statement that holds out future hope for the Jewish people.²⁷ The confines of this study obviously cannot bring rapprochement to these two very distinct positions. What can be said is that the implied reader, as part of the process of building consistency and coherence and filling gaps in the narrative, identifies an intratextual linkage between the closing scene in Acts and the fourth speech of the Galilean ministry. This retrospective activity of intratextual connectivity prompts the implied reader to reevaluate the various Jewish characters and character groups through the character taxonomies delineated by means of the four sowing examples contained in the fourth Galilean ministry speech. The result reinforces judgments made by the implied reader regarding the classification of those characters and character groups – highlighting the division between the Jewish people who fall into the fourth character taxonomy and those who fall into the three other character taxonomies.

6.3 Lukan Community

A number of attempts over the past two decades identify varying flesh-and-blood readers – or communities – for Luke-Acts. The proposed *Sitz im Leben* and corresponding community for the two-volume work run the gamut, from Jewish Christians, to Godfearers, to Gentile converts, and from Christians (insiders) to non-

implied author was using the LXX versus Mark in composing Acts 28.17-28. However, Lukan interest in “healing” could also be a reason for this redactional change (cf. Pilch, “Sickness and Healing,” 181-209).

²⁷For a bibliography on the different views concerning the closing scene of Acts, see the discussion in chapter eight.

Christians (outsiders). In regard to the latter, the vast majority of scholars believe that Luke-Acts was directed to an audience of insiders (viz., converted Christians).

Notwithstanding, recent investigation concerning the apologetic nature of Luke-Acts points toward the possibility of an unconverted Jewish audience, at least an element of the purported audience.²⁸ The ecclesiastical focus of the two-volume work, however, remonstrates against a view that adumbrates a singular evangelistic thrust and exclusively non-Christian audience.

Beyond the question of insider versus outside, scholarly debate around the identity of the Lukan community becomes much more murky. The following are some of the more prominent attempts to identify the Lukan audience. First, utilizing a sect-based sociological model, Esler constructs a socio-historical setting that reflects the theological agenda represented by the narrative discourse.²⁹ He subsequently argues that Luke-Acts addresses a Christian community largely comprised of Gentile Godfearers and Jewish converts seeking legitimacy during a time of adversity – a situation involving pressures from the Jewish synagogue and the wider Gentile society. Second, a number of scholars, perhaps best represented by the socio-historical analysis of Moxnes, contend that the symbolic systems represented within the narrative world create a window into the historical community of Luke-Acts.³⁰ Narrative interest in

²⁸Notably, see Alexander (“Acts of the Apostles,” 38-44) who concludes that “it does not follow that Luke’s primary readership is Gentile. Acts is a dramatized narrative of an intra-communal debate, a plea for a fair hearing at the bar of the wider Jewish community in the Diaspora, perhaps especially in Rome.”

²⁹*Community and Gospel*, esp. 220-23.

³⁰“Social Context,” 379-89; idem, “Social Relations,” 58-75; idem, *Economy of the Kingdom, passim*. Also, see David P. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* (Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, B6; Linz: Fuchs, 1983).

material benefaction and the binary opposites of rich and poor reflect a community struggling with the need for economic redistribution. Third, employing a similar methodological approach, Tyson argues that various characters – namely, Godfearers – in the Lukan narrative stand as symbolic representatives of the Lukan community.³¹ The apologetic aim of the narrative is to persuade these Godfearers that Christianity is the true derivation of LXX prophetic tradition. Fourth, drawing on a methodological framework based on narrative and reader-response considerations, Wasserberg poses that the Lukan community is broader – encompassing Godfearers as well as Jewish converts. Also, like Tyson, he proposes an apologetic purpose that places Jesus’ ministry and message and the early Christian movement in continuity with the LXX traditions. The latter stand in contradistinction with Pharisaic Judaism as represented by the Jewish characters and character groups opposing Jesus and then the early church.³² Fifth, Johnson pinpoints a concerted focus in the narrative discourse on the Jewish people and their reception and rejection of Jesus and then the early church, which he believes suggests a Gentile Christian readership concerned with the Jewish rejection of the gospel and its acceptance by Gentiles.³³ Luke-Acts, therefore, serves to provide the Gentile Christian audience with assurances involving the legitimacy of the Christian movement.

Optimism involving endeavors to identify communities behind each of the New Testament Gospels that arose during the last couple decades of the twentieth century

³¹*Images of Judaism*, 19-41; idem, “Reading as a Godfearer,” 19-38.

³²*Aus Israels*, 31-70, 179-90, 361-66.

³³*Gospel of Luke*, 3-10. Also, Robert J. Karris, “Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979) 80-97.

quickly turned to pessimism during the past decade on the basis of several concerns.³⁴ The first concern involves the definition of “community,” an ambiguous, slippery term that is difficult, if not impossible, to define. The second concern pertains to the implausibility of a complete and positive correlation between a text and social group that carries or receives it. In particular, construal of a text as a sociological mirror of the community to which it is addressed is extremely reductionist. A third concern relates to the erroneous assumption of many that the methodological framework for uncovering the rhetorical situations behind the New Testament Epistles can be applied in a similar manner to narrative materials – specifically the four Gospels. While the writing of many of the New Testament Epistles was prompted by social and theological situations facing their addressees, the pastoral and theological concerns of the four Gospels do not mirror crises facing the recipients.³⁵ A final concern involves the tendency of many to use the label of sect in construing the sociological composition of the four Gospels. The classification of the early church as a sect is a gross oversimplification and assumes that Christianity largely did not share the ideological systems of the surrounding culture – an assumption that is far from correct.

So, with the above concerns in mind, what can be said regarding the purported Lukan community? To begin, as demonstrated in chapter two, the few who argue for a singular addressee – namely, Theophilus³⁶ – fail to comprehend fully the nature of

³⁴These concerns are found in the various essays by Barton, “Early Christianity,” 140-62; idem, “Gospel Audiences,” 173-94; idem, “Sociology and Theology,” 459-72.

³⁵Note the comments of Johnson (“Lukan Community,” 90): “Reading everything in the Gospel narratives as immediately addressed to a contemporary crisis reduces them to the level of cryptograms, and the evangelists to the level of tractarians.”

³⁶Witherington, *Acts*, esp. 63-65; Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, xxxii-xxxiii.

literary patronage in Greco-Roman antiquity. Theophilus is not the only intended recipient but rather serves as the literary patron, circulating Luke and then Acts to his family and friends – perhaps Christians and non-Christians – as well as adopted brothers and sisters in Christ, which likely included various house churches. Second, a growing number of scholars acknowledge that it is virtually impossible to pinpoint a precise identity to the authorial audience – it is a mixed entity comprised of Gentiles, Jews, and Godfearers; various degrees of material possession; men, women, and children; and so forth.³⁷ They also concur that the narrative discourse exhibits a concern with legitimization and apologetic – an ecclesiastical focus that positions the Christian movement, as heirs of Jesus’ ministry and message, in accordance with the Jewish LXX traditions.³⁸ Third, on a related note and as recently shown, Luke-Acts, like other Greco-Roman narrative that espouses an ethnic mixing (or Romanization) of outsiders, constructs a new constitution that serves as an apology, legitimizing the formation of an early church comprised of Jews, Godfearers, and Gentiles.³⁹ In this context, emphasis on continuity with LXX traditions does not directly translate into a Jewish and Godfearer audience in need of legitimization. Rather, like other narrative

³⁷See, e.g., Joel B. Green, “Acts of the Apostles,” in *The Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, ed. Ralph Martin and Peter H. Davids (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1997) 7-24; Moxnes, “Social Context,” 379-89; Sterling, *Historiography*, 139-59; Marguerat, *Christian Historian*, 129-54; Downing, “First Reading,” 91-109.

³⁸See, e.g., Green, “Acts of the Apostles,” 7-24; Sterling, *Historiography*, 139-59; Marguerat, *Christian Historian*, 1-25, 129-54.

³⁹Note Balch’s comment (“ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ,” 139-88): “Luke represents not only a group with little cultural power but also a group of pork-eating, uncircumcised Gentiles who do not rest on the Sabbath. Such radical discontinuity threatens to bring a loss of identity. So Luke must claim continuity on other grounds: the reception of foreigners such as Cornelius was prophesied, authorized by the ancient prophets Moses and Isaiah, as well as the Lukan founder, Jesus.”

texts from Greco-Roman antiquity, Luke-Acts simply uses the heritage of the authorial audience – namely, the LXX traditions and Jesus, the founder – to corroborate the legitimacy of their practices and beliefs.

Taking the above into consideration, I would like to suggest several ways in which my analysis of the four Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus contributes to the ongoing discussion regarding the Lukan community. To begin, the speeches assume an intertextual repertoire that includes significant knowledge of the LXX traditions. The implied reader cannot build coherence and consistency – including fill gaps in the narrative – without this intertextual knowledge. Of course, this does not necessitate identification of an authorial audience comprised of individuals who have undergone full initiation to Judaism and/or Christianity; rather, it necessitates authorial readers with a general understanding of the LXX and moreover authorial readers who would attribute some sense of authoritative value to it. Additionally, as the rhetorical argument includes abduction (cf. Lk 6.36) – namely, *logos* based on the divine nature or past action by the divine – the authorial audience embraces belief in the monotheistic God of Judaism. This suggests an authorial audience of converted insiders – both Jew and Gentile are possible – or Jewish outsiders. Non-Christian Gentiles without sufficient knowledge of Judaism or Christianity would fall outside of purview. Second, at the same time, the speeches also assume extratextual knowledge on the part of the implied reader regarding Greco-Roman texts (cf. Lk 4.23; 7.32). An authorial audience consisting of Jewish Christians without broad exposure to Hellenistic culture thus fall outside of plausible parameters. Third, the rhetorical argument and resulting narrative trajectories around material benefaction – particularly

that of the second speech in 6.20-49 – infers that some of the authorial readers possess a certain degree of wealth. Finally, when *synkrisis* between John the Baptist and Jesus in the third speech is considered in conjunction with the larger narrative that addresses John the Baptist and his disciples, there seems to be a sufficient indication that some of the authorial readers may have been disciples of John the Baptist or, at the least, required clarification regarding the relationship between Jesus and John the Baptist.

6.4 Methodological Implications

Reading as conduction necessitates the use of an interdisciplinary methodological approach and moreover an integrated hermeneutic.⁴⁰ Historically, biblical scholars have tended to apply methodological tools in a one-dimensional manner, looking at form, source, and redactional issues during the first part of the twentieth century and then narrative, rhetorical, readerly, and ideological concerns during the past two decades. In many instances, these are silo-based approaches in which each methodological tool is applied separately. Though a comprehensive overview is not possible, the following are some hermeneutical implications that derive from my investigation.

⁴⁰Reading as “conduction” is discussed in detail in chapter two. See, in particular, Booth (*Company We Keep*, 70-77) for a description of reading as conduction. As to the need for an interdisciplinary methodology and integrated hermeneutic, see Joel B. Green, “Scripture and Theology: Uniting the Two So Long Divided,” in *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000) 23-43; Wactjen, “Hermeneutic Mode of Integration,” 75-94.

6.4.1 *Redaction Criticism and the Integrated Hermeneutic*

Redactional analysis is not only useful in helping to adumbrate historical issues and theological tendencies but in understanding different nuances of the rhetorical texture of speeches in the Gospels.⁴¹ Indeed, in my earlier analysis, I demonstrated that several redactional adjustments by the implied author of Luke-Acts actually bolster the rhetorical argument of the speech in question. Further, in some instances, *contra* claims that the implied author exhibits little regard for rhetorical conventions of the day,⁴² redactional modifications of source material from Mark and Q show particular sensitivity for rhetorical texture. Accordingly, biblical scholars who employ methodologies that arose during the last two decades of the twentieth century – such as narrative, reader-response, rhetorical, ideological criticisms – should take care in wholesale abandonment of methodologies such as redaction criticism, in that these methodologies can prove to be an extremely valuable component of a larger integrated, interdisciplinary hermeneutic.⁴³

⁴¹However cf. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, 228-60, who uses redactional analysis to read Matthew through the intertextual lens of Mark.

⁴²See, e.g., the comment of Kennedy (*New Testament Interpretation*, 67): “Luke 6 is not a very good speech.”

⁴³For a discussion, see John R. Donohue, “The Literary Turn and New Testament Theology: Detour or New Direction?” *Journal of Religion* 76 (1996) 250-75; Max Turner, “Historical Criticism and Theological Hermeneutics of the New Testament,” in *Between Two Horizons*, 44-70.

6.4.2 *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories*

The rhetorical texture of the speeches aids in the construction of overarching narrative issues such as plot, theme, characterization, and *topoi*.⁴⁴ The implied reader draws upon the rhetorical argument of the speeches in order to build meaning – a proleptic and analeptic activity – around the surrounding narrative action. Some of the more prominent ways in which this occurs range from use of the statement of case in the speeches to identify plot lines, theme, and *topoi*, to understanding how the narrative discourse concurrently conforms with and reinterprets ideological systems, to different taxonomies used in interpreting modes of characterization, to use of *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos* as a means of exercising rhetorical power over the implied reader. Analysis of rhetorical argument leads to the identification of instances where language – through *synkrisis* or *ecphrasis* – is used to place one ideological position over another, or one character or group of characters over another character or group of characters.

6.4.3 *Ideological Systems and Hermeneutical Transformation*

As covered in much greater detail in chapter ten, narrative discourse not only conforms with ideological systems but concurrently reinterprets and even challenges those same ideological systems. The rhetorical texture of the speeches is the key to unlocking these nuances of the narrative discourse in that deductive argument – particularly that of rhetorical questioning, maxims, and enthymemes – frequently serves as a means of provoking the narrative audience and implied reader to embrace an

⁴⁴For a discussion of ancient rhetoric in ancient narrative, see Robbins, “Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric,” 368-84.

ideological location that differs from existing cultural systems. The narrative events surrounding the speeches – as well as inductive argument contained within the speeches such as parabolic examples – serve as commentary, representing situations that define the ethnic, religious, and social worldviews presented in the speeches. For example, as discussed earlier, the two episodes in Lk 7.1-10 and 7.11-17 illustrate the implications of Jesus’ rhetorical argument in the first Galilean ministry speech for benefaction without concern for cultural reciprocity involving kinship and friendship.⁴⁵

6.4.4 *Authorial Readers and Hermeneutical Appropriation*

Reader-response critics, coupled with the research of classical scholars around the nuances of literary patronage in antiquity, highlight the importance of understanding hermeneutical appropriation from different reading locations. While certainly not a dynamic construct consisting of a near infinite number of ideological systems as in the case of postmodern authorial readers, the authorial audience of narrative in Greco-Roman antiquity is more than simply a one-dimensional construct -- the typical approach of most biblical scholars with an interest in hermeneutical appropriation. As I argue in chapter ten, however, while authorial readers of ancient Greco-Roman narrative actualize meaning from a dominant ideological framework, differences in cultural location affect the hermeneutical implications that are drawn regarding the narrative discourse. In the case of the four Galilean ministry speeches of Jesus, differences in wealth, power, gender, and ethnicity play a role in the

⁴⁵For in-depth discussion, see Brodie, “Towards an Unravelling,” 247-67; idem, “Imitation and Emulation,” 78-85; Robbins, “Socio-Rhetorical Role,” 81-93.

hermeneutical appropriation of the narrative discourse that arises from the rhetorical texture.

Over the past several years, a number of publications have appeared that address the need to examine the hermeneutical appropriation of biblical texts from multivalent reading locations. These studies primarily look at the construct of reader from the standpoint of flesh-and-blood readers of the twenty-first century.⁴⁶ My investigation shows the relevance of examining biblical texts, though with realization that authorial readers are a much more uniform entity – comprising a more uniform set of ideological systems – than the case with modern and postmodern authorial readers, from the lens of varied authorial readers. As such, the same narrative discourse brings consolation to one group of authorial readers while confronting the beliefs and actions of another group of authorial readers.

7 CONCLUDING SUMMARY

It would be difficult, if not impossible, for the narrative of Luke-Acts to make the journey from Galilee to Rome without Jesus' four Galilean ministry speeches. Each of the speeches play an important function in propelling the narrative down the "way" (ὁδός) and demarcating "sign posts" that provide the implied reader with frameworks from which to construct the narrative discourse. Viewing the speeches from the standpoint of ancient Greco-Roman rhetoric provides valuable insight into the

⁴⁶For an overview of these methodological inquiries, see, e.g., Fernando F. Segovia, "Cultural Studies and Contemporary Biblical Criticism: Ideological Criticism as Mode of Discourse," in *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective*, vol. 2, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 1-17; Mary Ann Tolbert, "Afterwords: The Politics and Poetics of Location," in *Reading from this Place*, vol. 1, 311-17.

frameworks from which authorial readers would have understood them. Out of the rhetorical texture extends various trajectories associated with narrative conventions such as theme, plot, characterization, and *topoi*. The stage is set, therefore, for hermeneutical appropriation when the implied reader combines the rhetorical texture and narrative trajectories. Authorial readers, in their hermeneutical appropriation – based on their cultural locations – strengthen, modify, and jettison ideological beliefs and protocols. In the end, the four Galilean speeches of Jesus make the long, event-filled journey from Galilee to Rome a worthwhile venture and transformative experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Paul J. "*Omne verbum sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990) 3-27.
- Adkins, W.H. "'Friendship' and 'Self-Sufficiency' in Homer and Aristotle." *Classical Quarterly* 13 (1963) 30-45.
- Aichele, George, et al. *The Postmodern Bible: The Bible and Culture Collective*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Aletti, J.-N. *Quand Luc raconte: Le récit comme théologie*. Lire la Bible 115. Paris: Cerf, 1998.
- Alexander, Loveday C.A. "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986) 48-74.
- _____. "Sisters in Adversity: Retelling Martha's Story." In *Women in Biblical Tradition*, ed. George J. Brooke, 433-37. *Studies in Women in Religious* 31. Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. Society of New Testament Supplement Monograph Series 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- _____. "Acts and Ancient Intellectual Biography." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Volume 1: Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 31-64. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- _____. "The Preface to Acts and the historians." In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III, 84-99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels." In *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham, 71-112. Grand Rapids and London: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- _____. "Marathon or Jericho? Reading Acts in Dialogue with Biblical Historiography." In *Auguries: The Jubilee Volume of the Sheffield Department of Biblical Studies*, ed. David J.A. Clines and Stephen D. Moore, 92-125. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 269. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

- _____. "Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998) 380-99.
- _____. "Formal Elements and Genre: Which Greco-Roman Prologues Most Closely Parallel the Lukan Prologues?" In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 9-26. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- _____. "Reading Luke-Acts From Back to Front." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheydon, 419-46. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- _____. "The Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text." In *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, et al., 15-44. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- _____. "Narrative Maps: Reflections on the Toponymy of Acts." In *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*, ed. M.D. Carroll, D.J. A. Clines, and P.R. Davies, 17-57. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 200. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- _____. "What If Luke Had Never Met Theophilus?" *Biblical Interpretation* 8 (2000) 161-70.
- Allen, Wesley O. *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 158. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- _____. "How Convention Helps Us Read: The Case of the Bible's Annunciation Type Scene." *Prooftexts* 3 (1983) 115-30.
- Anicia Co, Maria. "The Major Summaries in Acts: 2,42-47; 4,32-35; 5,12-16: Linguistic and Literary Relationship." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 68 (1992) 49-85.
- Argyle, A.W. "The Greek of Luke and Acts." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1973/74) 441-45.
- Armstrong, Paul B. *Conflicting Readings: Variety and Validity in Interpretation*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Aune, David E. "Septem Sapientium Convivium (*Moralia* 146B-164D)." In *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*, ed. Hans Dieter Betz, 51-105. *Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* 3. Leiden. Brill Publishers, 1978.

_____. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity 8. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

_____. "Luke 1:1-4: Historical or Scientific Prooimion?" In *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn*, ed. A. Christophersen, et al. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 217. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

_____. "The Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme in New Testament Scholarship." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003) 299-320.

_____. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament & Early Christian Literature & Rhetoric*. Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

Bakhtin, Mikael M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Translated Christine van Boheemen. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

_____. *On Meaning Making: Essays in Semiotics*. Foundations & Facets. Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1994.

Balch, David L. "Comments on the Genre and a Political Theme of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two Hellenistic Historians." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent H. Richards, 343-61. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

_____. "Rich and Poor, Proud and Humble in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*, ed. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough, 214-33. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

_____. "ἀκριβῶς ... γράψαι (Luke 1:3): To Write the *Full* History of God's Receiving All Nations." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 229-50. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- _____. "METABOAH ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ – Jesus as Founder of the Church in Luke-Acts: Form and Function." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 139-88. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Barton, Stephen C. "Early Christianity and the Sociology of the Sect." In *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?*, ed. Francis Watson, 140-62. London: SCM Press, 1993.
- _____. *Discipleship and Family Ties in Matthew and Mark*. Society of New Testament Monograph Series, 80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- _____. "Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?" In *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham, 173-94. Grand Rapids and London: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- _____. "Sociology and Theology." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 459-72. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Acts of Paul as Sequel to Acts." In *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Volume 1: Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 105-52. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Bauer, David R. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Bible and Literature Series 15. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988.
- Beardsley, Monroe. "Intentions and Interpretations: A Fallacy Revisited." In *Aesthetic Point of View*, ed. Michael Wreen and Donald Callen, 188-207. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. "'Expecting Nothing in Return': Luke's Picture of the Marginalized." *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 357-68.
- Beck, Brian E. "The Common Authorship of Luke and Acts." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976/77) 346-52.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968) 1-14.
- Black, Clifton, II. "Keeping up with Recent Studies: Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Interpretation." *Expository Times* 100 (1988/89) 252-58.
- _____. "John Mark in the Acts of the Apostles." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: A Collection of Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, 191-214. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Bonz, Marianne Palmer. *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- _____. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.
- _____. "The Ethics of Forms: Taking Flight with *The Wings of the Dove*." In *Understanding Narrative*, ed. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz, 99-135. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1994.
- Bosend, William F. II. "The means of absent ends." In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III, 348-62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Bovon, François. *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-three Years of Research [1950-1983]*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 12. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwith Press, 1987.
- _____. "The God of Luke." In *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*, 67-80. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 36. Translated by Jane Haapiseva-Hunter. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick, 1995.
- _____. "The Importance of Mediations in Luke's Theological Plan." In *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narratives*, 51-66. Translated by Jane Haapiseva-Hunter. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 36. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick, 1995.
- _____. "'How Well the Holy Spirit Spoke Through the Prophet Isaiah to Your Ancestors!' (Acts 28:25)." In *New Testament Traditions and Apocryphal Narrative*, 43-50. Translated by Jane Haapiseva-Hunter. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 36. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwith Press, 1995.

- _____. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9-50*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Hermenia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Braet, Antoine C. "Ethos, Pathos, and Logos in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*: A Re-examination." *Argumentation* 6 (1992) 307-20.
- Braumann, Gerhard. "Die Lucanische Interpretation der Zerstörung Jerusalems." *Novum Testamentum* 6 (1963) 120-27.
- Braun, Willi. *Feasting and social rhetoric in Luke 14*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990.
- _____. "The God of Promises and the News in Luke-Acts." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, 279-96. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- _____. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Brodie, Thomas L. "Towards an Unravelling of Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17-24." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986) 247-67.
- _____. "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative." In *New Views on Luke and Acts*, ed. Earl Richard, 78-85. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- _____. "Not Q but Elijah: The Saving of the Centurion's Servant (Luke 7:1-10) as an Internationalization of the Saving of the Widow and Her Child (1 Kings 17:1-16)." *Irish Biblical Studies* 14 (1992) 54-71.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1966.
- Burnett, Frederick W. "Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels." In *Listening to the Word of God: A Tribute to Dr. Boyce W. Blackwelder*, ed. Barry Callen, 69-88. Anderson, Indiana: Warner Press, 1990.
- _____. "Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels." *Semeia* 63 (1993) 1-29.

- Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Society for New Testament Monograph Series 70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Cadbury, Henry. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: McMillan Publishing Company, 1927.
- Cadzow, Hunter. "New Historicism." In *The John Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory & Criticism*, edited by Michael Groden and Martin Kreiswirth, 534-39. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Callan, Terrance. "The Preface to Luke-Acts and Historiography." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985) 576-81.
- Cameron, Ron. "'What Have You Come Out to See?' Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels." *Semeia* 49 (1990) 35-69.
- Camery-Hoggatt, Jerry. *Speaking of God: Reading and Preaching the Word of God*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.
- Camp, Gregory Alan. *Woe to You Hypocrites! Law and Leaders in the Gospel of Matthew*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Sheffield, 2003.
- Carras, George P. "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts: Paul, Jesus and Other Jews." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheydon, 693-708. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Carroll, John T. "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988) 604-21.
- _____. "The God of Israel and the Salvation of the Nations: The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles." In *Forgotten God: Essays in Honor of Paul J. Achtemeier on the Occasion of His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, ed. A.A. Das and Frank J. Matera, 91-106. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2002.
- Carruth, Shawn. "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20-49." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 98-115. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Carson, D.A. "Matthew 11:19b/Luke 7:35: A Test Case for the Bearing of Q Christology on the Synoptic Problem." In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 138-41. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978.

_____. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein. "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality." In *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, ed. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, 3-36. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad, 1986.

Combrink, H.J.B. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30." *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973) 27-47.

Conley, Thomas M. "The Enthymeme in Perspective." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984) 168-87.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of Saint Luke*. Translated G. Buswell. New York and London: Harper & Row, 1960.

Corbett, Edward P.J. *Classical Rhetoric and the Modern Student*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Corley, Kathleen E. *Private Women, Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993.

Cotter, Wendy. "The Parable of the Children in the Market Place, Q (Lk) 7:31-35: An Examination of the Parable's Image and Significance." *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987) 289-304.

_____. "Children Sitting in the Agora: Q (Luke) 7:31-35." *Forum* 5 (1989) 63-82.

_____. "'Yes, I Tell You, and More Than a Prophet': The Function of John in Q." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 135-50. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.

Couroyer, B. "De la mesure dont vous mesurez il vous sera mesuré." *Revue Biblique* 77 (1970) 366-70.

- Creech, Robert R. "The Most Excellent Narratee: The Significance of Theophilus in Luke-Acts." In *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays on Acts in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr.*, ed. Raymond H. Keathley, 107-26. Waco: Baylor University Press, 1990.
- Crockett, Larrimore C. "Luke 4:25-27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969) 177-83.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "The ANHP Question in Luke-Acts: Imperial Masculinity and the Deployment of Women in the Early Second Century." In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, 44-69. London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Greco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*. St. Louis: Clayton, 1982.
- Darr, John A. *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster Press, 1992.
- _____. "Narrator as Character: Mapping a Reader-Oriented Approach to Narration in Luke-Acts." *Semeia* 63 (1993) 43-60.
- _____. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- _____. "Irenic or Ironic? Another Look at Gamaliel before the Sanhedrin Acts 5:33-42)." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, 121-40. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Dawsey, James M. "The Literary Unity of Luke-Acts: Questions of Style – A Task for Literary Critics." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989) 48-66.
- de Beaugrande, Robert. "Discourse Analysis." In *The John Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*, ed. Michael Groden and Martin Kreiswirth, 207-10. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Deissmann, Adolf. "Hellenistic Greek with Special Consideration of the Greek Bible." In *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 39-59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- deSilva, David A. "Investigating Honor Discourse: Guidelines from Classical Rhetoricians." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards, 491-525. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

- _____. *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- _____. "Honor and Shame." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, 518-22. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Destro, Adriana, and Mauro Pesce. "Fathers and Householders in the Jesus Movement: The Perspective of the Gospel of Luke." *Biblical Interpretation* 11 (2003) 211-38.
- Dewey, Joanna. *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 48. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Diefenbach, Manfred. *Die Komposition des Lukasevangeliums unter Berücksichtigung antiker Rhetorikelemente*. Frankfurter theologische Studien. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knacht, 1993.
- Dihle, Albrecht. *Die Goldene Regel: Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der antiken und frühchristlichen Vulgärethik*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 28. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Douglas, Conrad R. "'Love Your Enemies': Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 116-34. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Downing, Gerald F. "Theophilus's First Reading of Luke-Acts." In *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett, 91-109. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 116. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. *Doing Things with Words in the First Christian Century*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 200. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Duff, Timothy. *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- Dupont, Jacques. *Les béatitudes: Le problème littéraire: Les deux versions du Sermon sur la Montagne et des Béatitudes*, 2d. Volume 1. Bruges and Louvain: Abbaye de Saint-Abbrè/E. Nauwelaerts, 1958.

- _____. "La conclusion des Actes et son rapport à l'ensemble de l'ouvrage de Luc " In *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, ed. J. Kremer, 359-404. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 48. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978.
- Ebner, Martin. "Feindesliebe – a ein Ratschlag zum Überleben? Sozial- und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mt 5,38-47 par Lk 6,27-35." In *From Quest to Q: Festschrift für James M. Robinson*, ed. Jon M. Asgeirsson, et al., 119-42. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- _____. "Interpretation and History." In *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini, 23-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- _____. "Overinterpreting texts." In *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini, 45-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- _____. "Between author and text." In *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*, ed. Stefan Collini, 67-88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Elliott, John H. "Patronage and Clientage." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 144-57. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Esler, Philip. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A. "Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987) 75-83.
- Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Farrell, Thomas B. "Aristotle's Enthymeme as Tacit Reference." In *Rereading Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. Alan G. Gross and Arthur E. Walzer, 93-106. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000.
- Finn, Thomas M. *From Death to Rebirth: Ritual and Conversion in Antiquity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.

- Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler. *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.
- _____, ed. *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Introduction*. Volume 1. New York: Crossroad, 1993.
- _____, ed. *Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary*. Volume 2. New York: Crossroad, 1994.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke*. 2 Volumes. Anchor Bible Commentary Series. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1981/85.
- _____. *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Fortenbaugh, William W. "Aristotle on Persuasion Through Character." *Rhetorica* 10 (1992) 207-44.
- Fowl, Stephen. "Texts Don't Have Ideologies." *Biblical Interpretation* 3 (1995) 15-34.
- _____. "The Role of Authorial Intention in the Theological Interpretation of Scripture." In *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 71-87. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- Fowl, Stephen, and L. Gregory Jones. *Reading in Communion: Scripture and Ethics in Christian Life*. Grand Rapids and London: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991.
- Fowler, Robert M. *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Freadman, Richard, and Seumas Miller. *Re-Thinking Theory: A Critique of Contemporary Literary Theory and an Alternative Account*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Freund, Elizabeth. *The Return of the Reader: Reader-Response Criticism*. London and New York: Methuen, 1987.
- Furnish, Paul Victor. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Fusco, Vittorio. "Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996) 1-18.

- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. 2d ed. New York: Continuum, 1992.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress Press, 1989.
- Gathercole, Simon. "The Justification of Wisdom (Matt 11.19b/Luke 7.35)." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003) 476-88.
- Gavrilov, A.K. "Reading Techniques in Classical Antiquity." *Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997) 56-73.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Gerdhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Gilbert, Gary. "Roman Propaganda and Christian Identity in the Worldview of Luke-Acts." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 233-56. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Gill, Christopher. "The *Ethos/Pathos* Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism." *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984) 149-66.
- _____. "The Question of Character and Personality in Greek Tragedy." *Poetics Today* 7 (1986) 251-73.
- _____. "The Character-Personality Distinction." In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling, 1-31. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Gilliard, Frank D. "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non omne verbum sonat*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993) 689-96.
- Gold, Barbara K. *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Gowler, David M. "Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach." *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 19 (1989) 57-62.

_____. *Host, Enemy, and Friend: Portraits of the Pharisees in Luke and Acts*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 2. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

_____. "Text, Culture, and Ideology in Luke 7:1-10: A Dialogic Reading." In *Fabrics of Discourse: Culture, Ideology, and Religion*, ed. David B. Gowler, L. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane F. Watson, 89-125. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Green, Joel B. "The Social Status of Mary in Luke 1,5-2,52: A Plea for Methodological Integration." *Biblica* 73 (1992) 457-72.

_____. "The Death of Jesus." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight, 146-63. Downers Grove and Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

_____. "Good News to Whom? Jesus and the 'Poor' in the Gospel of Luke." In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green, 59-74. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

_____. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Interpretation." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, 175-96. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

_____. "The Practice of Reading the New Testament." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, 411-27. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

_____. "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1-2." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1996) 61-86.

_____. "Internal Repetition in Luke-Acts: Contemporary Narratology and Lukan Historiography." In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III, 283-99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

_____. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.

- _____. "Acts of the Apostles," in *The Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, ed. Ralph Martin and Peter H. Davids, 7-24. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- _____. "'Salvation to the Ends of the Earth' (Acts 13:47): God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles." In *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 83-106. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- _____. "Scripture and Theology: Uniting the Two So Long Divided." In *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 23-43. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Culture." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, 2d ed., ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 225-32. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Grimshaw, Jim. "Luke's Market Exchange District: Decentering Luke's Rich Urban Center." *Semeia* 86 (1999) 33-51.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54 (1963) 155-87.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Halliwell, Stephen. "Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character." In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling, 32-59. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Hamilton, Paul. *Historicism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Hanson, K.C. "How Honorable! How Shameful! A Cultural Analysis of Matthew's Makarisms and Reproaches." *Semeia* 68 (1996) 83-114.
- Harker, John W. "Information Processing and the Reading of Literary Texts." *New Literary History* 20 (1989) 465-81.
- Hartin, Patrick J. "'Yet Wisdom Is Justified by Her Children' (Q 7:35): A Rhetorical and Compositional Analysis of Divine Sophia in Q." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 151-64. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.

- Havelaar, Henriette. "Hellenistic Parallels to Acts 5.1-11 and the Problem of Conflicting Interpretations." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 67 (1997) 62-82.
- Hayes, Richard B., and Joel B. Green. "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, 222-38. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Head, Paul M. *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Assessment of One Argument for Markan Priority*. Society for New Testament Studies 94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Heath, Malcolm. "Invention." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 89-119. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill Publishing, 1997.
- Hedrick, Charles W. *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrick Publishers, 1994.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- _____. *The Aims of Interpretation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Hoffmann, Paul. *Tradition und Situation: Studien zur Jesusüberlieferung in der Logienquelle und den synoptischen Evangelien*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1995.
- Horbury, William. *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Horsley, Richard. "Ethics and Exegesis: 'Love Your Enemies' and the Doctrine of Non-violence." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 54 (1986) 3-31.
- _____. "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 37-52. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- _____. "The Covenant Renewal Discourse: Q 6:20-49." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*, ed. Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan A. Draper, 195-227. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- _____. "The Kingdom of God as the Renewal of Israel." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*, ed. Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan A. Draper, 260-82. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Hunter, Virginia J. *Past and Process in Herodotus and Thucydides*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 211. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- _____. "The Interplay Between Creation and Interpretation." *New Literary History* 15 (1984) 387-96.
- _____. *The Fictive and the Imaginary: Charting Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- _____. *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Play of the Text." In *Languages of the Unsayable: The Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*, ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser, 325-39. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. 3d ed. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1972.
- _____. "The Daughters of Abraham: Women in Acts." In *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*, 122-37. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Johnson, Elliott E. *Expository Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Academie, 1990.
- Johnson, Luke T. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 39. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- _____. "On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, 87-100. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1987.

- _____. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Joubert, Stephan. "Coming to Terms with a Neglected Aspect of Ancient Mediterranean Reciprocity: Seneca's views on benefit-exchange in *De beneficiis* as the framework for a model of social exchange." In *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, 47-63. Biblical Interpretation Series 53. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Just, Arthur A., Jr. *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus*. Collegeville, Minneapolis: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Karris, Robert J. "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979) 80-97.
- Kavanaugh, James H. "Ideology." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, 2d ed., ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 306-20. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Kearney, Suzanne Marie. *A Study of Principal Compositional Techniques in Luke-Acts based on Lk 4:16-30 in Conjunction with Lk 7:18-23*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Boston University, 1978.
- Keener, Craig S. *Bible Background Commentary*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- _____. "Friendship." In *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, 380-88. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- _____. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Composition and Influence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*." In *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. A.O. Rorty, 416-24. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1996.
- _____. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks and Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World, 10. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003.

- Kern, Philip H. *Rhetoric and Galatians: Assessing an approach to Paul's epistle*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Kim, Kyoung-Jin. *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 155. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- _____. "The Pharisees in Luke-Acts." In *The Four Gospels 1992*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck, et al., vol. 2, 1497-1511. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- _____. "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus." *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 369-78.
- Kirk, Alan. "'Love Your Enemies,' The Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27-35)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003) 667-86.
- Kitzberger, Ingrid Rosa. "Mary of Bethany and Mary of Magdala – Two Female Characters in the Johannine Passion Narrative: A Feminist, Narrative-Critical, Reader-Response." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 564-86.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Q Parallels: Critical Notes and Concordance*. Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1988.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Luke's Gospel*. New Testament Readings. New York and London: Routledge Press, 1998.
- Koet, Bernard. "'Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29-32c-35) und Israels Geschick.'" In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, 2d vol., ed. Fran Segbroeck, 1149-69. Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1992.
- Konstan, David. "Reciprocity and Friendship." In *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, ed. Christopher Gill, Norman Postlewaite, and Richard Seaford, 279-301. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Krabel, A. Thomas. "The Disappearance of the 'God-fearers'." *Numen* 28 (1981) 113-23.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Translated T. Gora, A. Jardine, and L. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Kurz, William S. "Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts." *Biblica* 68 (1987) 195-20.

_____. "Narrative Models for Imitation in Luke-Acts." In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks, 171-89. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

_____. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster Press, 1993.

_____. "Intertextual Use of Sir. 48.1-16 in Plotting Luke-Acts." In *The Gospels and Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, 308-24. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

_____. "Effects of Variant Narrators in Acts 10-11." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997) 570-86.

LaFargue, Michael. "Are Texts Determinant? Derrida, Barth, and the Role of the Biblical Scholar." *Harvard Theological Review* 81 (1988) 341-57.

Lambrecht, Jan, S.J. "Rhetorical Criticism and the New Testament." *Bijdragen* 50 (1989) 239-53.

Lanigan, Richard L. "From Enthymeme to Abduction: The Classical Law of Logic and the Postmodern Rule for Rhetoric." In *Recovering Pragmatism's Voice: The Classical Tradition, Rorty, and the Philosophy of Communication*, ed. Lenore Landsdoff and Andrew R. Smith, 49-70. Albany, New York: SUNY Press, 1995.

Linton, Olof. "The Parable of the Children's Game: Baptist and Son of Man (Matt xi, 16-19 = Luke vii, 31-35): A Synoptic Text-Critical, Structural, and Exegetical Investigation." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975/76) 159-79.

Lofink, Gerhard. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfarts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 26. Munich: Kösel, 1971.

Lentz, John C. *Luke's Portrait of Paul*. Society of New Testament Supplement Manuscript Series 77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Lundin, Roger. *The Culture of Interpretation: Christian Faith and the Postmodern World*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.

MacDonald, Dennis R. "Luke's Eutychus and Homer's Elphenor: Acts 20:7-12 and Odyssey 10-12." *Journal for Higher Criticism* 1 (1994) 4-24.

_____. "The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999) 88-107.

_____. "Luke's Emulation of Homer: Acts 12:1-17 and Iliad 24." *Forum* 3 (2000) 197-205.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric of the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Mailloux, Steven. *Rhetorical Power*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Malberbe, Abraham J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Malina, Bruce. "Patron and Client: The Analogy behind Synoptic Theology." *Forum* 4 (1988) 2-32.

_____. "Interpretation: Reading, Abduction, Metaphor." In *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. David Jobling, et al., 253-66. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1991.

Malina, Bruce, and Jerome H. Neyrey. "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values in the Mediterranean World." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 25-65. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.

Marguerat, Daniel. "La mort d'Ananias et Saphira (Ac 5,1-11)." *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993) 209-26.

_____. "Saul's Conversion (Acts 9-22-26) and the Multiplication of Narrative in Acts." In *Luke's Literary Achievement*, ed. Christopher Tuckett, 127-55. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 116. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

_____. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

_____. "The Enigma of the Silent Closing of Acts (28,16-31)." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 284-304. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- _____. "The End of Acts (28,16-31) and the Rhetoric of Silence." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 74-89. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Tradition and Theology in Luke (Luke 8:8-15)." *Tyndale Bulletin* 20 (1969) 56-75.
- _____. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Textual Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Guides. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- _____. "'Israel' and the Story of Salvation: One Theme in Two Parts." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 340-57. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Matera, Frank J. "The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985) 469-85.
- Matson, David L. *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series 123. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- McArthur, Harvey K., and Robert M. Johnston. *They Also Taught in Parables: Rabbinic Parables from the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1990.
- McNicol, Alan J., David L. Dungan and David B. Peabody. *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Mealand, David L. "Hellenistic Historians and the Style of Acts." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 82 (1991) 42-66.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- _____. "Assisting the Word by Making (Up) History: Luke's Project and Ours." *Interpretation* 57 (2003) 151-62.

- Merenlahti, Petri. "Characters in the Making: Individuality and Ideology in the Gospels." In *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, 49-72. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Merenlahti, Petri, and Raimo Hakola. "Reconceiving Narrative Criticism." In *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, 13-48. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Miller, Robert J. "Elijah, John, and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988) 611-22.
- Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leandar E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 111-30. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- _____. "Jesus' Audiences, According to Luke." *Novum Testamentum* 16 (1974) 81-109.
- Mitchell, Alan C. "The Social Function of Friendship in Acts 2:44-47 and 4:32-37." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 255-72.
- _____. "'Greet the Friends by Name': New Testament Evidence for the Greco-Roman *Topos* on Friendship." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, 236-57. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Moessner, David P. "'The Christ must suffer': New Light on the Jesus-Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986) 220-56.
- _____. "And Once Again: What Sort of 'Essence'? A Response to Charles Talbert." *Semeia* 43 (1988) 75-84.
- _____. "Re-reading Talbert's Luke." In *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. Michael C. Parsons and Joseph B. Tyson, 229-40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- _____. "The Appeal and Power of Poetics (Luke 1.1-4): Luke's Superior Credentials (παρηκολουθηκότι), Narrative Sequence (καθεξῆς), and Firmness of Understanding (ἀσφάλεια) for the Reader." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 84-123. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- _____. "The Lukan Prologues in the Light of Ancient Narrative Hermeneutics: Παρηκολουθηκότι and the Credentialed Author." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheyden, 399-417. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Montrose, Louis. "New Historicisms." In *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn, 392-418. New York: Modern Language Association, 1992.
- Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism of the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Mark and Luke in Poststructuralist Perspectives: Jesus Begins to Write*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Moreland, Milton C. "The Jerusalem Community in Acts: Mythmaking and the Socio-rhetorical Functions of a Lukan Setting." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 285-310. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Moreland, Milton C., and James M. Robinson. "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 23-27, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995) 475-85.
- Morgan, Robert, with John Barton. *Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Morganthaler, Robert. *Lukas und Quintilian. Rhetorik al Erzählkunst*. Zurich: Gotthelf, 1993.
- Mott, Charles Stephen. "The Power of Giving and Receiving: Reciprocity in Hellenistic Benevolence." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, 60-72. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Overtures in Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- _____. "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 241-70. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.

- _____. "Social Relations and Economic Interaction in Luke's Gospel." In *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. Peter Luomanen, 58-75. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- _____. "Honor and Shame." *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 23 (1993) 167-76.
- _____. "The Social Context of Luke's Community." *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 379-89.
- _____. "Honor and Shame." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 19-40. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- _____. "Kingdom Takes Place: Transformation of Place and Power in the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke." In *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, 176-209. Biblical Interpretation Series 53. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Nadeau, Ray. "Delivery in Ancient Times: Homer to Quintilian." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 50 (1964) 53-60.
- Neiryneck, Frans. "Luke 4,16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheydon, 357-95. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table-Fellowship." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 361-88. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- _____. "Luke's Social Location of Paul: Cultural Anthropology and the Status of Paul in Acts." In *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III, 251-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honour: The cultural context of the original makarisms in Q." In *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context*, ed. Philip F. Esler, 139-58. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. "'Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke.'" *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978/79) 324-44.

- _____. "Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and the System of Purity." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 80-105. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Nolland, John. "Classical Rabbinic Parallels to 'Physician, Heal Yourself' (Luke iv 23)." *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979) 193-209.
- _____. *Luke 1-9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary Series 35a. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Noorda, S.J. "'Cure Yourself, Doctor! (Luke 4,23): Classical Parallels to an Alleged Saying of Jesus.'" In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus – The Sayings of Jesus. Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, ed. Joël Delobel, 459-69. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Leuven University, 1982.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians." In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks, 216-36. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- _____. "Delivery and Memory." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 159-70. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill Publishing, 1997.
- Osiek, Carolyn, and David L. Balch. *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1997.
- O'Toole, Robert F. "Reflections on Luke's Treatment of Jews in Luke-Acts." *Biblica* 74 (1993) 547-55.
- Overman, James A. "The God-Fearers: Some Neglected Features." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988) 17-26.
- Palmer, David W. "Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph." In *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 1-29. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. "The Unity of the Lukan Writings: Rethinking the *Opinio Communis*." In *With Steadfast Purpose: Essays in Honor of Henry Jackson Flanders, Jr.*, ed. Raymond H. Keathley, 29-53. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1990.

- _____. "Luke and the *Progymnasmata*: A Preliminary Investigation into the Preliminary Exercises." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 43-64. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Patte, Daniel. *Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: A Reevaluation*. Louisville: Westminster Press, 1995.
- Payne, Philip B. "The Order of Sowing and Ploughing in the Parable of the Sower." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978/79) 123-39.
- Penner, Todd. "Contextualizing Acts." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 1-22. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- _____. "Civilizing Discourse: Acts, Declamation, and the Rhetoric of the *Polis*." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 65-104. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Pervo, Richard. *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- _____. "Must Luke and Acts be Treated as One Genre?" *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richard, 306-17. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- _____. "A Hard Act to Follow: *The Acts of Paul* and the Canonical Acts." *Journal of Higher Criticism* 2 (1995) 3-32.
- _____. "Israel's Heritage and Claims upon the Genre(s) of Luke and Acts: The Problems of History." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 127-46. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Peterson, Norman R. *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Phelan, James. *Reading People, Reading Plots: Character, Progression, and the Interpretation of Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

- Phillips, Thomas E. *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 48. Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.
- _____. "Reading Recent Readings of Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke and Acts." *Currents in Biblical Research* 1 (2003) 231-70.
- Pilch, John J. "Sickness and Healing in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 181-209. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- Pilgrim, Walter E. *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1981.
- Piper, Ronald A. "The Language of Violence and the Aphoristic Sayings in Q: A Study of Q 6:27-36." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 53-74. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Thucydides 1.22.1 and Speeches in Acts: Is There a Thucydidean View?" *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990) 121-42.
- _____. "The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to the Pauline Epistolary Literature." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 108-16. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- _____. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Biblical Languages Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What Are They Saying About Luke?* New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990) 93-110.
- _____. *What Is Narrative Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Praeder, Susan Marie. "Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul, and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Responses." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards, 23-39. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.
- _____. "Acts 27,1-28.16: Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984) 683-706.

- Price, Robert M. *The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist Critical Scrutiny*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 155. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Prince, Gerald. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1987.
- _____. *Narrative as Theme: Studies in French Fiction*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977) 121-41.
- _____. *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- _____. "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism." In *Contemporary Literary Theory*, ed. G. Douglas Aitkins and Laura Morrow, 81-100. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.
- _____. "Where We Are When We Read." In *Authorizing Readers: Resistance and Respect in Teaching of Literature*, ed. Michael Smith and Peter J. Rabinowitz, 1-28. New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1997.
- Räsänen, Heikki. "The Redemption of Israel." In *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. P. Luomanen, 94-114. Paderborner Theologische Studien 54. Helsinki and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Reimer, Richter I. *Women in the Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Reisner, Marius. "Love of Enemies in the Context of Antiquity." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001) 411-27.
- Rese, Martin. "The Jews in Luke-Acts: Some Second Thoughts." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. J. Verheydon, 357-95. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Rhoads, David. "Narrative Criticism: Practices and Prospects." In *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, 264-85. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Forth Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

- _____. *Time and Narrative*. 2 Volumes. Translated Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Golden Rule: Exegetical and Theological Perplexities." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990) 392-97.
- _____. *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics, II*. Translated Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1991.
- Ringe, Sharon. *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee: Images for Ethics and Christology*. Overtures in Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages." In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert, 215-42. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978.
- _____. "Pragmatic Relations as a Criterion for Authentic Sayings." *Forum* 1 (1985) 35-63.
- _____. "The Chreia." In *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*, ed. David E. Aune, 1-23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- _____. "Pronouncement Stories from a Rhetorical Perspective." *Forum* 4 (1988) 1-31.
- _____. "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 305-22. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- _____. "Luke-Acts: A Mixed Population Seeks a Home in the Roman Empire." In *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday C.A. Alexander, 202-21. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- _____. "Introduction: Using Rhetorical Discussions of the Chreia to Interpret Pronouncement Stories." *Semeia* 64 (1993) vii-xvii.
- _____. "Social Scientific Criticism and Literary Studies: Prospects for Cooperation in Biblical Interpretation." In *Modelling Early Christianity: Social Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*, edited by Philip Esler, 274-89. London and New York: Routledge Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge Press, 1996.

- _____. "Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1996 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards, 368-84. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Present and Future State of Rhetorical Analysis." In *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 32-41. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 146. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- _____. "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: A Collection of Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, 191-214. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- _____. "The Claims of the Prologues and Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Prefaces to Luke and Acts in Light of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Strategies." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 63-83. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- _____. "The Socio-Rhetorical Role of Old Testament Scripture in Luke 4-19." In *Z Noveho Zakona /From the New Testament: Sbornik k narozeninam Prof. ThDr. Zdenka Sazavy*, ed. Hana Tonzarova and Petr Melmuk, 81-93. Praha: Vydala Cirkev ceskoslovenska husitska, 2001.
- Robinson, James M. "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12-14 July, 22 November 1991." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 500-08.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "The Pre-Industrial City in Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey, 125-49. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- _____. "Legitimizing Sonship – A Test of Honour: A social-scientific study of Luke 4:1-30." In *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-scientific studies of the New Testament in its context*, ed. Philip F. Esler, 183-97. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Rosenblatt, Marie-Eloise. *Paul the Accused: His Portrait in Acts of the Apostles*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Roth, John S. *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 144. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Rowe, Galen O. "Style." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 121-57. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill Publishing, 1997.

- Rüger, H.P. "Mit welchem Mass ihr messt, wird euch gemessen werden (Mt 7:2, Gen 38:25-26)." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60 (1969) 174-82.
- Sacks, Kenneth S. "Rhetorical Approaches to Greek History Writing." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards, 123-33. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Saller, Richard. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Sanders, Jack T. "The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert, 104-28. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Satterhwaite, Philip E. "Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric." In *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting: Volume 1: Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 337-80. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Scholes, Robert. *Protocols of Reading*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Scholes, Robert, and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Schottroff, Luise, and W. Stegemann. *Jesus von Nazareth: Hoffnung der Armen*. 3d ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990.
- Schreck, Christopher J. "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4:16-30 in Recent Study." In *L'Evangile de Luc – The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Frans Neirynck, 399-471. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2 vols. 3d ed. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.
- Schwartz, Sandra. "The Trial Scene in the Greek Novels and Luke-Acts." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 105-38. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Scobie, C.H. *John the Baptist*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

- Scott, J.M. "Luke's Geographical Horizon." In *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Greco-Roman Setting: Volume Two*, ed. D.W.J. Gill and Conrad Gempf, 483-544. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- Seccombe, David P. *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, B6. Linz: Fuchs, 1983.
- Segovia, Fernando F. "Cultural Studies and Contemporary Biblical Criticism: Ideological Criticism as Mode of Discourse." In *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective*, vol. 2, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, 1-17. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke and Acts*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994.
- Sheeley, Steven M. *Narrative Asides in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 72. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Shepherd, William H., Jr. *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 147. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Shiner, Whitney. *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Siker, Jeffrey S. "'First to the Gentiles': A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 73-90.
- Sim, David. "The Woman Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3." *Heythrop Journal* 30 (1989) 51-62.
- Sloan, Robert. *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilarly Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Austin, Texas: Schola Press, 1977.
- Smallwood, Mary E. *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 20. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987) 613-38.
- Smith, Michael and Peter J. Rabinowitz. *Authorizing Readers: Resistance and Respect in Teaching of Literature*. New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1997.

Smith, Robert H. "Hypocrite." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight, 351-53. Downers Grove and Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.

_____. "The Speeches in Acts in Relation to Other Pertinent Ancient Literature." *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 70 (1994) 65-90.

Spencer, Scott F. "Acts and Modern Literary Approaches." In *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, 381-414. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.

_____. "Neglected Widows in Acts 6:1-7." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994) 715-33.

_____. *Acts. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Spencer, Patrick E. "Narrative Echoes in John 21: Intertextual Interpretation and Intratextual Connection." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 75 (1999) 49-68.

Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Society of New Testament Supplement Manuscript Series 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Staley, Jeffrey A. "'With Power of the Spirit': Plotting the Program and Parallels of Luke 4:14-37 in Luke-Acts." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards, 281-302. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

_____. "Narrative Structure (Self Stricture) in Luke 4:14-9:62: The United States of Luke's Story World." *Semeia* 72 (1995) 173-213.

Stamps, Dennis L. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: Entextualization of the Situation in New Testament Epistles." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 193-210. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Sterling, Gregory L. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*. *Novum Testamentum Supplement Series* 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

- _____. “‘Athletes of Virtue’: An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994) 679-96.
- Stichele, Caroline Vander. “Gender and Genre: Acts in/of Interpretation.” In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 311-30. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Stout, Jeffrey. “What Is the Meaning of a Text?” *New Literary History* 14 (1982) 1-12.
- Suleiman, Susan R., and Inge Crosman, eds. *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Manuscript Series 20. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- _____. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- _____. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Book of Acts*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- _____. “Once Again: Gospel Genre.” *Semeia* 43 (1988) 53-74.
- _____. “Reading Chance, Moessner, and Parsons.” In *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. Michael C. Parsons and Joseph B. Tyson, 229-40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- _____. “The Acts of the Apostles: monograph or ‘bios’?” In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III, 58-71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. “Conversion in the Acts of the Apostles: Ancient Auditors’ Perceptions.” In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, 141-53. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Talbert, Charles H., and John H. Hayes. “A Theology of Sea Storms in Luke-Acts.” In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim Upon Israel’s Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 267-83. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- Tannehill, Robert C. "The Mission of Jesus According to Luke IV 16-30," in *Jesus in Nazareth*, ed. E. Grässer, 51-75. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.
- _____. "Israel in Luke-Acts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985) 69-85.
- _____. "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." In *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*, ed. Joseph B. Tyson, 83-101. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988.
- _____. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986/1990.
- _____. "'Cornelius' and 'Tabitha' Encounter Luke's Jesus." *Interpretation* 48 (1994) 347-56.
- _____. "Should We Love Simon the Pharisee? Hermeneutical Reflections on the Pharisees in Luke." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 21 (1994) 424-33.
- _____. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Story of Israel within the Lucan Narrative." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 325-39. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Social Reality and the First Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.
- Thomas, Rosalind. *Literary and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Thompson, Michael B. "The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation." In *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham, 49-70. Grand Rapids and London: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- Thompson, Richard P. *Christian Community and Characterization in the Book of Acts: A Literary Study of the Lukan Concept of the Church*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Southern Methodist University, 1996.

- _____. "Believers and Religious Leaders in Jerusalem: Contrasting Portraits of Jews in Acts 1-7." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, 327-44. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Tiede, David L. "'Glory to Thy People Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 21-34. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Tolbert, Mary Ann. *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- _____. "How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character." *Interpretation* 47 (1993) 347-57.
- _____. "Afterwords: The Politics and Poetics of Location." In *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, vol. 1, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, 311-17. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Tompkins, Jane P. "The Reader in History: The Changing Shape of Literary Response." In *Reader-Response: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. Jane P. Tompkins, 201-32. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Toohey, Peter. *Reading Epic: An Introduction to the Ancient Narratives*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Topel, John. "The Tarnished Golden Rule (Luke 6:31): The Inescapable Radicalness of Christian Ethics." *Theological Studies* 59 (1998) 475-85.
- Tracy, Stephen V. *The Story of the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark; Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Turner, Max. "Historical Criticism and Theological Hermeneutics of the New Testament." In *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 44-70. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984) 574-83.

- _____. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- _____. "Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 19-38.
- _____. *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.
- _____. "From History to Rhetoric and Back: Assessing New Trends in Acts Studies." In *Contextualizing Acts: Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*, ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele, 23-42. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 20. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003.
- Vaage, Leif E. "Composite Texts and Oral Mythology: The Case of the 'Sermon' in Q (6:20-49)." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, 75-97. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "The Reader in New Testament Interpretation." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Joel B. Green, 301-28. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- _____. *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1998.
- van de Sandt, H. "Acts 28,28: No Salvation for the People of Israel?" *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 70 (1994) 341-58.
- van Unnik, W.C. "Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32-35." *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966) 284-300.
- Vison, Richard B. "A Comparative Study of the Use of Enthymemes in the Synoptic Gospels." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson, 93-118. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Waetjen, Herman C. "Social Location and Hermeneutical Mode of Integration." In *Reading from this Place: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States*, vol. 1, ed. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, 75-94. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- _____. "The Subversion of 'World' by the Parable of the Friend at Midnight." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120 (2001) 703-21.

- Walaskay, Paul W. *“And So We Came to Rome”: The Political Perspective of St. Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Wall, Robert W. “Successors to the ‘Twelve’ according to Acts 12.1-17.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53 (1991) 628-43.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Wasserberg, Günter. *Aus Israels Mitte – Heil für die Welt: Eine narrativ-exegetische Studie zue Theologie des Lukas*. Beihefte zu Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 92. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Wheeldon, M.J. “‘True Stories’: the Reception of Historiography in Antiquity.” In *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, ed. A. Cameron, 33-63. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Wilcox, Max “The ‘God-Fearers’ in Acts – A Reconsideration.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 13 (1981) 10-22.
- Wilson, Stanley G. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 CE*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Wimsatt, William K., and Monroe Beardsley. “The Intentional Fallacy.” In *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*, ed. William K. Wimsatt, 193-225. New York: Noonday Press, 1966.
- Wink, Walter. “Jesus’ Reply to John: Matt 11.2-6/Luke 7.18-35.” *Forum* 5 (1989) 121-28.
- _____. “Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus’ Third Way (Matt 5:38-42//Luke 6:29-30).” *Forum* 7 (1991) 5-28.
- Witherington, Ben III. “On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples – Luke 8:1-3.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979) 243-48.
- _____. “Editing the Good News: some synoptic lessons for the study of Acts.” In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III, 324-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Cambridge and Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- Witherup, Ronald D. “Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 48 (1992) 67-86.

- _____. "Cornelius Over and Over Again: 'Functional Redundancy' in the Acts of the Apostles." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 49 (1993) 45-66.
- Wolter, Michael. "Israel's Future and the Delay of the Parousia, according to Luke." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim Upon Israel's Legacy*, ed. David P. Moessner, 307-24. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987) 448-63.
- _____. "Hermeneutics and Rhetorics: From 'Truth and Method' to 'Truth and Power'." *Scriptura* 3 (1989) 1-54.
- _____. "Arrangement." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 51-88. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill Publishing, 1997.
- Wuthnow, Robert. *Communities of Discourse: Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and European Socialism*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Yamada, Kota. "A Rhetorical History: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles." In *Rhetoric, Scripture, and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 230-50. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 131. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- _____. "The Preface to the Lukan Writings and Rhetorical Historiography." In *The Rhetorical Interpretation Scripture: Essays from the 1996 Malibu Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps, 154-72. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 180. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- York, John O. *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 46. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Declaration

This dissertation is the product of my own work, and the work of others has been properly acknowledged throughout.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

